THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXV.—OCTOBER, 1900—No. 100.

A COMMISSION ON THE GREEK ORDINAL IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

WHILST lately in Rome awaiting the conclusion of some business in one of the Congregations I obtained permission to make researches in the archives of Propaganda. Amongst the great mass of papers which passed under my eyes during the weeks I was able to devote to the work one set of documents proved of special interest to me, as they threw considerable light upon the state of theological opinion on the question of "the tradition of instruments" in the Sacrament of Orders in the early part of the seventeenth century.

As all students know, there has long been a great difference of opinion as to what is the essential matter of the diaconate and priesthood. It has been assumed, and is very commonly asserted, that from the rise of scholasticism, and certainly since the Council of Florence and the "Instructio ad Armenos" of Pope Eugenius IV. up to very recent times no one in the Latin Church questioned the ordinary teaching of theologians that the essential matter of orders was the "tradition of instruments," *i. e.*, for the diaconate the giving of the Book of the Gospels, for the priesthood of the chalice, etc., to the candidate. Further it is asserted that inasmuch as this was practically the universal and official opinion of the authorities of the Latin Church, many questions as to the validity of the Sacrament of Orders were determined in the light of this assumed prin-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1899, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

ciple—questions which might have been decided in a very different manner had other and, as it is now believed, sounder views as to the matter of the sacrament prevailed. It is now unnecessary, of course, to say that this assumption made by some writers that the tradition of instruments was practically accepted by all theologians from the thirteenth century downward as the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders, is as a fact not borne out by an examination of their works. These prove beyond doubt that teachers in theological schools, and above all the authorities of the Latin Church, were always aware that there was another opinion, and that certainly from the sixteenth century in any decision on the question of the validity of orders what is called the scholastic view had no undue weight.

The documents I came across in the Propaganda archives fully confirm this opinion as to the full knowledge of the Roman theologians on this matter in the early seventeenth century. The Congregation de Propaganda Fide was established in 1622, and in the early years of its existence much of its resources and a great deal of its energy was occupied in the printing and publishing of books which would be useful for the work of spreading and defending the faith. For this purpose a press was established and types to print in the Oriental languages were prepared, and in the volumes of the "Acta" appear constant notes from which the history of the Propaganda press might be written. In 1636 a question was raised as to the publication by the Congregation of a new edition of the Greek "Euchologium," or book of the Greek services and rites. On March 4 of that year Cardinal Barberini, then Prefect of the Propaganda, pointed out the need of preparing an edition of the Greek liturgy for the Oriental churches in general and for those who followed the Greek rites in Italy in particular. It would appear from his statement that the editions of the "Euchologium" which existed, and notably that printed in Venice "post annum 1557," were considered to be faulty and required careful correction, and a Commission was thereupon appointed by the Pope to thoroughly examine the whole question.

This Commission came together for its first meeting on April 24, 1636, and so seriously did it fulfil its mission that it only terminated its labors in 1640, having held some sixty-five sessions. During those meetings the whole book of Greek rites was taken, part by part, and the matter and form of the sacraments as well as the ritual for the celebration of Holy Mass was fully gone into. At the commencement it was agreed that to insure full consideration one member of the Commission should be appointed to act as exponent. He was specially to study the matter for discussion, and was apparently to take the side adverse to the existing Greek ritual. Father Vincent

Richardus, a Theatine, was asked to take this position, and in the various meetings which followed his censura formed the groundwork of all the debates.

The fact of this Commission having sat in the seventeenth century was, of course, well known by the Preface of Morinus in his great work "De Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinibus," which in one sense may be said to have been the outcome of studies undertaken as a member of this Commission. Morinus dedicates his work to the president, Cardinal Barberini, and says that he was called to Rome in 1639 by the Cardinal and a few days later was summoned to take part in "a Commission appointed by Pope Urban VIII. to consider the Greek Euchologium." When he first took his place at the sittings, he says, the inquiry into the validity of the rite of Greek ordinations had begun, and he seems to imply that it was through his exertions, or mainly through the light he was enabled to throw on the subject, that the Commission was saved from making a great mistake in this matter. "It appeared to me," he writes, "not quite safe to settle a question of such moment on the teaching of the scholastics alone." In his view the members had no sufficient knowledge of Greek or of the Greeks, "nor had it entered into their minds to inquire what, how many and of what nature the Greek forms of ordination were." It will be seen that in this opinion about his brother commissioners Morinus was hardly fair, although no doubt the arguments and knowledge of the learned French Oratorian had great weight with them. He was not, however, able to remain to the end of the meetings, for after having been nine months in Rome he was suddenly recalled by Cardinal Richelieu to Paris. "Why I was called back," he says, "I know not, but the order of such a man could not be disobeyed." The interest created in his mind by the discussions, however, continued after his return. The matter constantly occupied his attention and finally took the form of the volume prepared for publication in 1655, in which he set himself to prove that what "many of the scholastics" had taught to be the essential form of orders were in the old rituals conspicuous by their absence.

From the "Acta" of this Roman Commission, to which I now call attention, I believe for the first time, it appears that even before Morinus came to Rome the fathers were fully aware of the difficulties as to the scholastic view about the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders, which indeed the mere examination of the "Euchologium" must have brought out. We are not concerned with the early discussions of the Commission, but early in 1639—in the thirty-fourth session—the question of the sub-diaconate was formally raised by the Theatine, Father Vincent Richardus. The point was clearly stated by the ponente: in the ordination of sub-deacon could

the old form of the Euchologium be kept, since it ordered mere imposition of hands, whereas according to the Latin rite the order was conferred by the tradition of the chalice without any such imposition? He quoted the Council of Florence, or rather Eugenius IV.'s "ad Armenos," which he considered settled the question absolutely by declaring the tradition of instruments to be the essential matter of the sacrament. The ponente consequently strongly advocated the substitution of this for the mere imposition of hands found in the "Euchologium."

A certain Cistercian, Abbot Hilarion, another member of the Commission, although admitting that the important question of the tradition of instruments should be most carefully examined, was himself of opinion that it was not necessary or essential and that the matter of the sacrament was clearly the imposition of hands as found in the Greek Ordinals. As proof that the orders conferred without "the instruments" had been regarded as right and valid, he quoted Clement VIII. in his instruction "Super ritibus Italo-Græcorum" (August 31, 1595), in which the Pope dealt expressly with the orders of those "ordinati ab Episcopis schismaticis" according to Greek forms, and assumes throughout their unquestionable validity.

At this meeting Cardinal Barberini spoke "at length and expounded the ground of both opinions. As a practical conclusion he advocated the thorough examination of the question, because if the Commission were to advise that the 'tradition of instruments' should be insisted upon it was greatly to be feared that such a decision would be attacked not only by the Greeks, but by many of the Latins" who did not believe in their necessity.

It is obvious from the above that at this period in the sittings of the Commission the fathers were fully alive to the importance of the questions at issue in regard to the matter and form of orders, and it was only after two more sessions, in which the discussion was continued, that the members determined, in order to sift the matter to the bottom, to obtain the assistance and advice of other skilled authorities. On July 9, 1639, consequently, three new names were added to the Commission. One was Father Anthony Hickey,[1] an Irish Franciscan, of St. Isidore's, Rome, and another the well-known French Oratorian, Morinus. On August 14 the new members for the first time took their seats on the Commission, which was then holding its thirty-seventh session. The question being debated was, as Marinus indeed tells us in his Preface, the subject of the

[1] Father Hickey was doubtless proposed by Father Luke Waddington, who was at this time constantly consulted by the Propaganda officials. Father Hickey's portrait is painted on the walls of the "Hall of the Theses" in S. Isadore's with the following inscription: "Ad modum R. Pater Fr. Antonius Hignælus, Emeritus S. Theologiæ Professor: Totius Ordinis Definitor Generalis: Vir in omni scientiarum genere conspicuus; studio totus et orationi deditus: Diversorum author operum: Vita ac morum gravitate exemplarissimus.

Greek ordinations, and the discussion of the sub-diaconate was again resumed by the ponente, Father Vincentius Richardus. He, as usual, took the position of uncompromising hostility to the Greek forms, and in his role of *advocatus diaboli* maintained (1) that in the Euchologium there was not sufficient matter and form, (2) that there was no tradition of instruments which rendered it essentially defective, and (3) that the words used did not sufficiently signify the power of the order bestowed. Further, that the form of words made use of was "*deprecativa et non efficiunt quod significant, neque significant quod efficiunt.*" Moreover, he could not accept the view held by some authorities that the essential matter of orders was "the imposition of hands," for it appeared to him to be distinctly against the Councils, the ancient practice of the Roman Church and practically condemned by the words of Pope Eugenius IV. in his Instruction to the Armenians. In this opinion he was followed by one other member of the Commission, who also added that in his opinion there was no real distinction made in the Euchologium between the sub-diaconate and the diaconate.

The other five members, including Cardinal Barberini, Father Anthony Hickey and Morinus, held that the Greek form was certainly sufficient, and that no change should be made in it. They gave their reasons with some minuteness, and they briefly amount to the claim that the imposition of hands was the only essential and necessary matter of the sacrament. They refer to the authority of the learned Greek, Arcudius, whose work on this very question had not long before been published in Rome, with the approval of Roman theologians and at the command of Pope Paul V., and their arguments are mainly drawn from the sixth book of the learned treatise. They maintained that this authority fully proves *(late probat)* that the Greek rites never had any other matter than "the imposition of hands," and that in primitive times there could have been no "tradition of instruments" since to take the case of the diaconate, the book of the Gospels could not have been given, or anything equivalent to it, by the Apostles in their ordinations.

The principle that Morinus advocated in the examination of the Greek liturgy, as he tells us in the Preface of his work, was that if the Greek rites before and after the schism were shown to be the same, then there could be no doubt that the Euchologium contained all the essential rites of ordination. If, on the other hand, it was found that changes had been introduced, it would be necessary to examine the nature of these introductions, or omissions, and to discover the intention which had prompted the changes. For this purpose Morinus obtained copies of the Greek ritual, certainly going

back beyond the days of the schism, and satisfied himself that the "Euchologium" then being examined was in its forms practically identical with these.[2]

Moreover, the upholders of the sufficiency of the Greek rites pointed out that although it was well known that the Oriental church had never made use of any other form of orders than the imposition of hands and prayer, still the validity of the ordination of Eastern churches had never been called into question by the Latins: neither at Lyons nor at Florence had any doubt been thrown upon the reality of these orders, nor the slightest hint thrown out that the Oriental forms were invalid. On the contrary, the Greeks had always been accepted as true priests and honored as true bishops. Further, in 1254 Pope Innocent IV., in his letter to a legate who had been sent to Cyprus to end disputes which had arisen between the Latin and the Greek bishops in the island, went carefully into the question of the Greek rites. In regard to the orders conferred by the Greek bishops he merely desired that the three minor orders, not specifically given in the Greek ordinals, should be added "according to the custom of the Roman Church," and in clearly admitting the validity of the orders in general, says nothing about the necessity of any tradition of instruments. This position of Pope Innocent IV. in regard to the Greek forms of ordination was, moreover, in full accord with his previous teaching in the schools. As the canonist, Sinibaldi, he had maintained that imposition of hands accompanied only by some form to specify the order, such as *Esto Sacerdos*, would be sufficient for the valid bestowal of sacred orders.

The Commissioners, in order to show that their view, that the tradition of instruments was not necessary, was a novel teaching, referred to the authorities adduced by the learned Arcudius and to the even more recent teaching of Hallier, a professor at the Sorbonne, who whilst urging in practice the necessity of bestowing the chalice, etc., on the priest with the accompanying form, as signifying clearly the sacrificial character of the priesthood, still held that there could be no doubt whatever that imposition of hands was the necessary and essential matter of the sacrament. To the authority of Hallier the fathers of the Commission added the weight of "other more recent teachers," such, for example, as the admitted theses maintained in the theological faculty of Paris in 1633, 1639 and 1640. These are referred to by Dom Hugo Medaro in his edition of St. Gregory's "Sacramentary," and are amply sufficient to indicate that the trend of the then theological opinion was in favor of the view held by the majority of the Commission.

[2] On his return to Paris Morinus told Goar, the Dominican, who was then engaged in editing the Greek ritual books of two copies he had seen in Rome, better than those he had for the basis of his edition.

In summing up their arguments in favor of the Greek traditional forms, the fathers maintained that "the Sacrament of Orders was instituted by Christ our Lord in such a way that the consecration of ministers was effected by certain words, or symbols, or external signs by which the ministry to which the candidate was to be ordained was signified. The determination of specific symbol or sign, however, was left to the will of the Church. The one thing which at all times appeared as a part of the ordination services both in the Greek and Latin Churches was imposition of hands accompanied with prayer. Whilst the Latins had added to the ancient forms the tradition of instruments to emphasize the character of the order more clearly, the Eastern churches had left them as they were, and there could be no sort of reason why they should now be added to make them like the Western forms.

The majority of the Commissioners met the assertion of the ponente that at the Council of Florence Eugenius IV. had settled the question once for all by a denial that the "Instructio ad Armenos" really taught what it was suggested it did, namely, that the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders was the tradition of instruments accompanied by the usual form of words and nothing more. "The Council of Florence," they say, "did not exclude, but rather assumed, the existence of the Greek rites and merely gave to the Armenians the more perfect forms which the Latins made use of in conferring the Sacrament of Orders." In other words: Eugenius IV. only intended in this "Instructio" to state what, in addition to the imposition of hands, which the Armenians already made use of, the Latins required *de facto*. It was on the one hand obvious that the Council of Florence and the Pope fully and completely acknowledged as valid the orders of the Greeks, and on the other that when asked to state the Latin forms it was only reasonable that the Pontiff should give the additional rite of the tradition of instruments, upon which the teaching of the scholastics had insisted so strongly. It cannot be conceived as possible that Eugenius IV. could have intended to suggest that the orders as given by the Greeks were invalid, seeing that both he and the fathers of the Council of Florence admitted their validity. Neither is it likely that his words were intended to imply that there was no need of any imposition of hands since it formed an integral part of the existing Latin rite. This is all the more certain since the Pope and his successors, as the fathers of the Commission point out, most certainly continued to accept the orders bestowed by the Greek Church without any tradition of instruments. Taken by itself, it is possible to misunderstand the "Instructio ad Armenos," but its terms must be interpreted by the circumstances of the times when it was given and by the way in

which the people of the time understood its meaning. The action of the Popes in regard to Greek ordinations leaves no real doubt as to the meaning to be attached to the direction. If, for the sake of argument, it be admitted that the Pope did intend to lay down as certain the narrow scholastic opinion that the tradition of instruments only was the essential matter of orders, it is still open to disagree with this opinion. In practice the Pope did not himself maintain such a view, as the mere fact of his accepting orders conferred without this proves beyond any possibility of cavil or doubt. If it was Pope Eugenius' opinion (which it is almost impossible to believe), then we may hold, as the fathers of this Commission say: "It was a practical instruction to the Armenians, and no dogmatic definition on the nature of the sacrament." *(In prædicta instructione definitionem de fide non conteneri.)*

So far as the Commission was concerned this discussion seems practically to have decided their opinion on the question of the tradition of instruments, the sense of the members being clearly that the imposition of hands was the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders. When in the next session, held on August 28, 1639, the rite of ordination to the priesthood was taken into consideration the point was raised only in the general statement of the objections and difficulties at the conclusion. The point here proposed to the Commissioners as the first difficulty was whether the second imposition of hands with its accompanying form: *"Accipe spiritum sanctum quorum remisserites peccata,"* which was not to be found in the "Euchologium," was not essential as conveying the powers of the keys to the priest, which Our Lord had bestowed on his Apostles after the Resurrection. Several members of the Commission argued against the necessity and adduced many strong reasons to support their contention. The fact that, although in the Greek forms there never was any such second imposition of hands, and that nevertheless no one had called in question the validity of their orders, was insisted upon. One of the Commission pointed out that theologians like Sotus and Valentia held that the Greek rite implicitly contained the whole of the Latin forms. "In this latter," he said, "the second imposition of hands was added at a late period to explain the nature of the sacerdotal powers more clearly." There were not two forms, but one, and it was certain that this and many other additions had been made by the Latins at comparatively late times in order to emphasize more clearly the nature of the sacrament. This he concluded was obviously the case, since in the most ancient Roman form of orders there was only mention of imposition of hands with prayer and nothing more.

Father Anthony Hickey, the Irish Franciscan, took the same view

most strongly, saying that it was not open to doubt that orders in primitive years were always given by the imposition of hands and prayer. He suggested that as in process of time the sacrificial character of the Christian priesthood came to be expressed very definitely by the tradition of the chalice and with its accompanying words, it became almost necessary to introduce something so as to emphasize the ministerial side of the priestly office and the power of the keys. In the Greek forms, as indeed in the oldest Western forms, both were sufficiently expressed in the same form.

The discussion was continued through several sessions, some of the members allowing that they were doubtful about the point at issue; but Morinus expressed himself as clear that the second imposition, etc., was quite a late introduction in the Western Church, and certainly not to be found in any of the ancient Greek or Oriental liturgies. Besides this point, upon which all the argument appears to have been on the one side, the question whether a deprecatory form, such as that in the Euchologium: "May Divine Grace make thee, N, now a deacon, into a priest," was raised and its validity similarly maintained by Morinus and others, who laid stress upon the fact that all the Greek forms from ancient times had always been of this kind and had nevertheless always been acknowledged by the Roman Church.

Before the close of the arguments on this matter, in March, 1640, Morinus had been recalled to France, but his departure does not appear to have changed the views of the Commission. In March, April and May at the meetings a considerable portion of the time was taken up in resuming the discussion on the necessity of the tradition of instruments. Throughout one thing appears clearly: that all fully admitted the fact that this was not an ancient part of the rite, but a comparatively modern introduction, and that what had always existed from the days of the Apostles was imposition of hands and prayer, as then found in the Greek Euchologium. One of the fathers—Antonius Marulus—who had joined the Commission shortly before the close of the discussion, at great length summed up the historical argument by adducing examples of the admission of the imposition of hands as the essential matter of the sacrament during the nine previous centuries. In the course of the argument, too, various theologians were quoted, amongst others the Jesuit Martin Becanus, who taught definitely at the end of the sixteenth century that "Orders are bestowed by the imposition of hands and the word of the ordaining Bishop;"[3] that "there must be imposition of hands is absolutely certain and has never yet been questioned by any one," and that "the imposition of hands would appear to be the essential matter of this

[3] His "Summa" was published in 1619.

sacrament instituted by Christ; the tradition of instruments, on the other hand, would seem to be accidental only and introduced by the Church."

The position taken by the Commission generally would appear, then, to be the following: Just as Pope Benedict XV. considered that in the Greek sub-diaconate all the minor orders were implicitly contained, so the Latin rite had by its introduction of the tradition of instruments and the second imposition of hands only amplified and more clearly expressed what was actually contained in the simple imposition of hands and the accompanying words of the Greek rite and the earliest Latin forms. The latter had not really changed the form, but had merely expanded and extended it to give it great significance.

This attitude of mind was mainly formed, as we have seen, upon the work of Arcudius. This learned Greek priest, a native of Cyprus, after having done much to help in the settlement of the Oriental difficulties, died at the Greek College in Rome, in 1634, two years before the meeting of this Commission. In 1619 he had published his folio volume on the agreement between the Greek and Latin Churches in matters of doctrine, etc. In this work, when treating the question of orders, besides showing that the Greek priesthood, etc., had always been acknowledged by the Latins, although given without any tradition of instruments, he claims to prove that even among the scholastics he finds evidence of the principle that imposition of hands was the essential matter of the sacrament in spite of their common teaching. He bases this declaration on St. Bonaventure's opinion, who in his Commentary on the fourth "Book of the Sentences" says: "In sacred orders, since a high and excellent power is therein conveyed, imposition of hands is used, and not mere tradition of instruments, for the hand is the organ of organs in which in an especial way the power of action resides. Hence in the primitive Church, where only the two orders (of deacon and priest) were explicitly given, ordinations were conferred in this way."

Again: "To what has been objected on this: that orders, as we have them, are given by the bestowal of the Book or chalice, we reply that as the (virtue of) every instrument is in the giving of it by the hand, so where there is no such tradition of instruments their import is signified by the imposition of hands alone. Hence . . . in the primitive Church all the orders, which in process of time were made distinct and more explicit both as to words and signs and persons, were conveyed by the imposition of hands. . . .

"It is to be understood that there was always some word to express the fact that such or such a power was bestowed; but only in

two sacraments did Our Lord Himself determine the special form of words. In the case of the rest, though some words are necessary, the actual form was not determined, but any words expressing the sense, in as far as it is *de ratione sacramenti*, are sufficient, so long as he who uses them does not intend to introduce any heresy. Now, of course, it is necessary to keep the forms appointed and approved by the Church . . . It is untrue to say that in the primitive Church there were none but *holy* orders; the rest were implicitly given in the imposition of hands.

In some notes on this portion of St. Bonaventure's teaching the editors of the recent edition say: "Many of his contemporaries, taking a more strict view than St. Bonaventure, maintained that the character of orders was bestowed by the tradition of instruments with the accompanying words. This is most frequently understood of all orders, even the priesthood, which is given by the bestowal of the chalice with wine and the paten with bread, and the diaconate, conveyed by the Book of the Gospels. This is even said in plain terms in the decree *pro Armenis*. But, on the other hand, the friend of St. Bonaventure, Peter Tarantesius (afterwards Pope Innocent V.), excepted the diaconate and the priesthood, which he asserted were given by the imposition of hands." The same opinion has been constantly maintained in the Church, either practically by the full recognition of Greek orders, or by the teaching of some theologians, at all times. The Council of Trent refrained from settling this question on the ground that the fathers had not met to arrange disputes between theologians; but when treating of the Sacrament of Orders the Council implicitly supports the view maintained by Arcudius, since it speaks of sub-deacons being ordained by the bestowal of the cruets and of "priests *rite ordinate per impositionem manuum presbyterii*." Moreover, we know from the history of the Council that the question was formally raised in the session held in 1562. The Cardinal of Lorraine at first desired that it should be distinctly stated that the matter of the sacrament of the priesthood was the imposition of hands, but subsequently "he considered that where what is necessary for the Sacrament of Orders is given it would be better not to designate specifically the matter and form; not that these did not exist, but because in this sacrament they could not easily be determined. On the other hand, he would like to see some mention made of the imposition of hands, since it was named so frequently in the Old and New Testaments. His opinion on this point met with universal approval, although finally, in order not to define positively that imposition of hands was the essential part of the sacrament, the more general expression "words and signs" was determined upon to state the component parts of the Sacrament of

Sacred Orders. Still the imposition of hands was not wholly passed over in silence, since in the decree itself the words of St. Paul to Timothy: *"Admoneo te ut resuscites gratiam Dei, quæ est in te per impositionem manuum mearum"* are quoted.

It must, of course, be borne in mind that the Council of Trent had already taught distinctly (Sess. 21, c. ii.) that although "in dispensing the sacraments" the Church might appoint or change what was proper to their administration according to times and places, this power did not, of course, extend to their substance as determined by Our Lord. *(Salva earum substantia.)*

It is upon this teaching that many theologians of the seventeenth century, and in particular Morinus and other fathers of the Commission which sat upon the Greek "Euchologium" based their arguments, maintaining that imposition of hands was the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders. In the West they say, in effect, the earliest forms of ordination prove that imposition of hands only was used, just as we find in the Greek Church at the present day, and since "the essential matter of the sacraments is immutable, as the Council of Trent declares," whatever the Church may subsequently order to be added by way of expansion or explanation, the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders must remain to-day what it was in the first ages, the imposition of hands.

F. A. Gasquet, O. S. B.

London.

LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN.

THE death of Charles Lord Russell of Killowen on the 18th of August is a loss not merely to his family, not merely to friends and acquaintances, however large the circle may be; it is a loss to the United Kingdom in general and that part of it called Ireland in particular which will not be repaired in our time. One circumstance we mention before passing to graver interests is that he had given promise, given earnest of the promise of successful legislation concerning a class of commercial dishonesty which had escaped the attention of previous law reformers, at least in a clear, searching and scientific manner. Whatever legislation of that kind there had been was only incidental to other legislation, and its main effect was illustrative or declaratory. The considerable efforts at Law Reform identified with the names of Lord Westbury and Earl Cairns were confined to practice and procedure. A mischief in the

very midst of commercial activity was untouched except so far as the spirit of provisions of the bankruptcy code suggested a danger to adventurous promoters or agents, and except so far as recognized principles in the Chancery side of the High Court of Justice might lay hold of persons in a fiduciary position taking advantage of the confidence reposed in them. This mischief Lord Russell began to deal with; and if his mantle have not fallen on some disciple, we fear the continuance of successful fraud.

It has been said the distinguished career of Lord Russell is an argument against Home Rule; that the separation of Irish and English interests would deprive able and ambitious Irishmen of the wider field open to them under the existing arrangement. There is nothing in the point except an assumption which in one form or another runs though the whole policy of centralization. The assumption is that imperial interests are exclusively English and that the local interests of Ireland are in conflict with imperial interests. The scheme for Home Rule recognizes the place of Ireland in the Empire and her representatives as part of it. Even Lord Rosebery's suggestion of a policy in the phrase "predominant partner" is nominally, at least, in advance of the principle couched under the assumption just spoken of. It implies some rights of partnership in the subordinate member of the firm. Even in pre-Union times, when the Irish legislature was a sovereign and at the lowest view a quasi-international body—it was very jealous of its style and title—the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland—even in pre-Union times the field of imperial labor was open to Irishmen, and many became distinguished in policy and arms. We may mention Lord Moisa, afterwards Marquess of Hastings, and Mr. Burke as Irishmen who rendered considerable services to imperial policy; but for our part, indeed, we should prefer an adequate career for our own gifted countrymen at home if the choice were to lie between the fields of local and imperial labor. But no such election is necessary, for under Home Rule certain Irishmen will sit in both houses of the imperial Parliament, and thereby gain opportunities for service and distinction more surely guaranteed than under the present arrangement, which imposes difficulties upon them only to be overcome by transcendent ability or by conspicuous faithlessness. The deeper and more enduring aspect of the question of conflict of interests between Ireland and England—the latter an impudent and despotic synonym for the term Empire—shall appear in our attempt to put before the reader our estimate of Charles Russell.

The great cases—except one—in which he was counsel cannot be dealt with in this paper. It may be sufficient to say that his income was set down at £25,000 a year. This at the common-law bar, we

believe, has never been surpassed if equaled. Even the thirteenth juryman, as Scarlett[1] used to be called, does not seem to have reached that figure. Some may have attained it at the equity bar; some possibly at the Parliamentary bar. At the latter Mr. Hope-Scott was credited with £20,000 a year, and we have always heard it said that he stood highest. We may mention a remarkable consensus of opinion with regard to Russell's power of cross-examination. This question was asked in a newspaper some years ago: Who was the ablest cross-examiner? From all parts of England correspondents wrote their opinion, and Russell may be said to have been elected by plebiscite. Now when one knows what an instrument of the Nisi Prius lawyer the power of cross-examination is, we must perceive that with such an expression of opinion he could not be left out of an important case. A good speech to evidence is all right, but without the power to test witnesses, solicitors and clients alike attach little value or comparatively little value to the making of a speech. We shall give some instances. Mr. Whiteside, afterwards Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, was one of the last of the race of giant orators, yet he was never allowed to handle a difficult witness. We were told long ago of a solicitor that he would bring Whiteside into a great case for the purpose of addressing the jury, but he would take care also to employ him in a case going on at the same time in an adjoining court. To this other court he would get Whiteside called when it was necessary to let a good cross-examiner at an important witness in the first one. Mr. Whiteside, not knowing the secret, thought such drawing of him from one court to another was a compliment; he was in such demand as it were. Sure we are of this, that he was never paid a special fee to stay all the time in one court, as poor Butt used to be, and as a great ally of our own, Mr. Francis McDonough, used to be.

We have implied that Russell's success as an advocate is not the measure of his greatness. Even in the short period he was on the bench he is admitted to have given proofs of qualities equal to those of the greatest of the long and illustrious line of Chiefs of the Queen's Bench.[2] This is no ordinary praise. Men of every variety of power and accomplishment filled the great place since the Conquest; we believe there is hardly more than one man since the time of that Gascoyne, whose name is familiar to the readers of Shakespeare, down to the last occupant but was distinguished as a scholar, a lawyer or statesman, and sometimes as all three. Perhaps the one exception is that lawyer who presided at the Court of High Commission which tried Charles I., but it may be said for him, take it as

[1] Lord Abinger. We have an idea that £13,000 a year was his professional income.
[2] Though John Bradshaw, the Lord President of the Court of Regicides, is not ordinarily included in the list of Chiefs of the King's Bench, still his position was the same.

its value, that he has the unqualified praise of Milton for his scholarship and law, so that the premier Bench as it was when there were three common-law courts may be said to have had chiefs of unique distinction all through since the reign of Henry IV. and very great men amongst its chiefs anterior to that reign.

But not even in his mastery as an advocate or a judge, or both, can we form the standard of Russell's amazing clearness of intellect in grasping complicated facts and ability in imparting with clearness his possession of them. His speech at the Parnell Commission is not merely that of a great advocate—and it is that in the highest sense—but it is the speech of a statesman rising above all others save his own countryman, Edmund Burke. In that inquiry his other qualities as an advocate found full scope. His discussions from time to time on the admissibility of evidence were models of rational test and inference directed to restriction where an act of Parliament had fixed the issues to be tried. A more incredible outrage on common decency and sense was only once committed, and that was when the King was ordered to be tried for treason against himself. Even "the lurdan Parliament,"[3] famous for the absurdities of its legislation, never dreamt of being legislators and pleaders at the same time, never thought of creating political offenses and appointing a special tribunal to try them, thought not of settling the pleadings and directing the issues for both sides. This is what the dreadful Unionist Government of 1886 and the few years succeeding accomplished; and the wonder is not at the one-sided report as we have it, but that so much justice was reached by the able and honorable men who presided, in spite of the clogs upon their feet. There seems to be no improvement in the spirit of the party. A recent incident indicates that a bewildering recklessness, if not worse, still governs it. If the conversation alleged by Dr. Clark, a Scotch member, to have taken place between himself and Mr. Chamberlain with reference to certain matters before the war in South Africa be correctly reported, the Colonial Secretary stands in the invidious position of impeaching the loyalty of Lord Russell. We do not think it necessary to vindicate that great judge from the aspersions of the right honorable gentleman. We will only offer a contrast—while a son of the noble and learned lord was fighting for his Queen and country, the Chamberlain family were only making money by the war, making money by the supply of munitions for the war under contracts exceptionally favorable to themselves. No, there is no need to defend Lord Russell; his character can be trusted to his brethren of the Bar, to his colleagues of the Bench, to the affectionate gratitude of the English people, for whose interests he sacri-

[3] Parliamentum indoctum is the historic name, which is translated in old English as above.

ficed weeks going from platform to platform when his moments were literally to be counted by guineas. He has in his life left an example admirable indeed for those qualities which fire the ardor of the young and generous and win the homage even of the aged and cautious, even of those chilled to appreciation of the higher impulses of our nature. But this is not his greatest praise. At a time when political faith is regarded as a superstition, when the hucksters of party are inspiring influences, when Tadpole and Taper and not their statesmen lead the Liberal party, when Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Rhodes and the De Beers Company govern the party in power, when the voice of justice is no longer hearkened to and the demands of liberty and reason silenced by the bludgeons and revolvers of Mr. Balfour's mobs, the life of Russell is a redeeming example; and we hope its influence will recall the people of England to the policy of the great chief who almost emancipated them from the thraldom of the classes.

Mr. Chamberlain's arraignment of the honor and loyalty of the Lord Chief Justice, though of no value where fair play has influence, no value because proceeding from the impartial betrayer of every man and party that trusted him, is full of ill-omened possibilities when the Ministers are the same, their allies the same as when Charles Russell broke down the gigantic conspiracy against the Irish people in the persons of their leaders. Edmund Burke declared to the tyrannical government which taxed America and ruled Ireland by the worst species of martial law—an armed, licentious and ferocious class allowed a free hand over a defenseless people—Burke told that government that it could not indict a nation. The impossibility seemed to have been effected by the party of Mr. Chamberlain and Pigott; but though the indictment was framed and prosecuting counsel appeared in exceptional strength from the allied forces in England and their henchmen of the Bar of Ireland, though from purlieus and prisons the social outcast and the felon emerged to give the testimony which would supply means of continued profligacy to the one and secure liberty to the other, the conspiracy was shattered to atoms by Russell's unbounded energy and courage. This success is the first motive for the hatred of the Colonial Secretary; the second is that Lord Russell tried and sentenced the ringleaders in the Jameson Raid. The secret complicity of Mr. Chamberlain in that extraordinary violation of public law was, we think, never doubted even by his friends. The proofs have not been given, but the suspicion which attached to his conduct, pregnant enough in all conscience, is raised to certainty if the statements of Dr. Clark can be relied upon. Nothing but the vindictiveness of a disappointed man could have found in the charge of the

Lord Chief Justice to the jury ground for the impeachment of his loyalty. We do not deny the ability of Mr. Chamberlain, but he seems eaten up by a restless vanity which his admirers call ambition and a love of experimental policies which he and they mistake for statesmanship. The strong sense of a great constitutional judge interpreting statutes passed to preserve amity with friendly States in accordance with the meaning of the words and the policy embodied in them was the offense given to the Colonial Secretary. The presumption which prompted him to call members of Parliament to account could not very well urge even him to an attack on the Chief Justice and his rulings. If made during the prosecutions Lord Russell would have laid him by the heels for contempt of court; if made since the trial, it would have afforded Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour a justification for his dismissal, against which the entire gang of Liberal Unionists, from the Duke of Devonshire to Mr. Jesse Collings, would protest in vain. The dignity and interest of the Empire were, in the opinion of Ministers, involved in the selection of Russell to represent it on the Venezuelan arbitration.

And now we turn from this paltry episode to the thought of what Mr. Gladstone accomplished in the one act of appointing Russell Attorney General. It is impossible to do justice to the courage of that great man who in making the appointment placed himself on a plane far above the traditions by which bigotry was consecrated in England. When he raised that Irishman to the Attorney Generalship he effected a revolution as though no effect remained from the enactments of evil days, as though the intolerance, the calculated opinion, the national turn of thought, the exclusiveness of habit, the privileges resting on descent and education had vanished into the darkness of the past and all the influences which had gone to form the Englishman since the Reformation and the social system of which he was a part had been lifted off by a magician's wand. That Charles Russell was worthy of the high distinction every one admitted then, every one will say now, except the colleague who plotted against Mr. Gladstone, his former leader, as he plots against Lord Salisbury, his leader, now.

Though we refrain from particular allusion to many of the lesser things which cling to the memory of Russell and which in obituary notices have found place as indicating some trait of character, some quality of power, some degree of the esteem in which he was held, we are tempted to mention a curious fact or fiction which seems to mark him off from all the public men of the day. True or false, it affords testimony of the opinion which prevailed in England that Russell's high character was a protection for those who trusted him. When men of different parties meet they are usually guarded by the

presence of some persons who may be appealed to in subsequent disputes. The honor of public men is one thing, but considerations of interest are another. Memory is treacherous, party feeling strong, the medium through which things are seen varying. Now the incident we refer to, known as the "strange" dinner party, is an exception to meetings of the kind. No precaution was taken; Russell simply had as his guests Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Parnell and Lord Randolph Churchill. The story is told as if he had a power to bring into harmony men of the most diverse opinions or bring them together without any of them fearing a trap. It was a most important triumvirate; for there was the old man eloquent, whom the Radicals looked up to as the statesman whose policy would secure the rights of all classes at home and the respect of foreign powers by a firm and dignified attitude of peace; there was the man who embodied the wrongs of Ireland and the man who was the hope of wise Toryism. If this story be not true, it still is a recognition of the high estimate which the English people had of Russell as a man unselfishly faithful to their best interests. Until Mr. Chamberlain implied that Lord Russell could prostitute his office to his ambition, drag his ermine in the dust in order to win a victory for his political allies, no one had ever thought of attributing to him an unworthy motive. We shall by and by offer a point to show a sacrificing love of Ireland not even thought of.

Public men cannot escape criticism. It is not always that they receive justice from contemporary opinion, but it does sometimes happen that the purity of a character is so clear that the base who mine in the dark alone are active to overthrow it. It was not suspected that the man—this Catholic and Irishman—selected by the Unionist Government to represent England in the Venezuelan treaty was resting in tranquillity on the surface while Mr. Chamberlain was sapping the ground beneath. It is impossible for him who has not observed the ways of the Colonial Secretary to judge of the danger to Russell lying in the possibilities of Mr. Chamberlain's ever obtaining supreme power.

A structure compacted from plausible mendacities and religious and national hate would conceivably lash the English public into a fury such as possessed their ancestors in the days of the Popish Plot, which in a less degree spent itself in the Gordon riots, which found expression in the Ecclesiastical Titles Act and which made the lives of Irishmen unsafe in England and subjected their country to a draggonade when the phrase "Parnellism and Crime" was a household word from Berwick to the Land's End. If time and circumstance favored Mr. Chamberlain, there is nothing rash in thinking that Russell would have been removed from his office under an obloquy

for the time recalling the infamy of Scroggs and of Jeffries; that a broken heart would bring him to the grave; that his family instead of finding, as now, a consolation for their sorrow in universal sympathy, would be driven to seek in another land the toleration of pity, and then, as usual in such cases, would come the tardy, ineffectual acknowledgment of injustice by which Englishmen fancy they repair the most odious and most cruel wrongs.

Passing in review the period when Russell practised as an attorney and solicitor in Ireland until as a Lord Chief Justice and a peer he represented England in international tribunals, we behold what appear to be the evidences of a vast change in the conditions of society. At the same time we must be on our guard lest we take casual phenomena for the effect of profound principles. His appointment has this value with regard to the sentiment of the English people, it is a break in the continuity of evil precedents. The authority of Protestant exclusion from the two offices which, even more than the Lord Chancellorship, mark the triumph of English Reformation principles is impaired. The Attorney General was the officer specially charged with the duty of asserting the legal aspect of Protestantism, all that it meant of insular pride and independence of foreign codes; the Lord Chief the functionary to declare as law the triumph of English over Latin principles of jurisprudence. There was to be no going back to external decrees and foreign interpretation; the self-sufficiency of the English intellect and will in the realms of law and order was to be maintained henceforth, even more than in the domains of theology. Protestantism in England came to be looked upon, despite the high pretensions of the Tudors and the Stuarts, as the spirit of the Bill of Rights. It was a sort of air in which trial by jury, habeas corpus, popular representation, taxation by consent, Ministerial responsibility, and so on, were born and nourished. To pass into this atmosphere as a potent spirit, controlling its forces as though he were an intelligence native to the very air, was the fortune of Charles Russell—to our mind a more striking success than that which put Benjamin Disraeli at the head of the landed interest of England and made him head of the British Empire as the representative of the landed interest.

These are the broad aspects of Lord Russell's rise, but they do not tell the qualities of the man in their full significance. A few words and we shall, we think, prove to the American reader that his life is wonderful as a fairy tale. We have only to state the facts to obtain the English reader's recognition of the marvel. Knowing as we do his start in life, we have no hesitation in saying that if we had been in some way cut off from surrounding intercourse while possessing an exact knowledge of political and social life in England,

the parties, the interests, the prejudices that react on individual dispositions, we have no hesitation in saying that reading a biography of Russell, presenting the steps of his advancement only, would carry with us the authority of one of Victor Hugo's nightmares of fiction.

He had begun life in the lower branch of the legal profession in Ireland. He might have obtained a leading practice in Petty Sessions and Quarter Sessions and been the Catholic rival of the Orange champion, John Rea. His name would not have passed beyond the limits of these little local courts, for nothing would have induced a man of his excellent good sense to imitate the eccentricities which carried the name of Rea over the country as that of the bravo of irreconciliables, whether Orange or Fenian. His services to the Liberal party in local politics might have been rewarded with a Sessional Crown Solicitorship, in which office it would be his province to instruct counsel for the Crown in the few cases that might be sufficiently important for their services in Petty Sessions and to prosecute in person the larcenies and common assaults which constitute the criminal jurisdiction of Quarter Sessions. He might rise to the dignity of country solicitor for a few landlords, whose boxes with their names inscribed in large white letters ranged on shelves in his office would have an imposing effect on the small shop-keeper and farmer, his ordinary clients. It would be a respectable but an obscure life.

But he must have been born with a silver spoon of more than ordinary dimensions. He went to England like so many of his countrymen of ability and ambition, instancing the prediction of Grattan in one of his anti-Union speeches that the fall of Ireland would draw to the capital of the country to be enriched by her fall every Irishman conscious of great gifts and the energy to employ them well. It is difficult to see at the first how this young Belfast attorney expected to brush aside the obstacles to his career. He was unknown in the classes which might be useful to him in the country of his adoption. We think the few Catholics of landed estate in England would prefer any one to an Irishman. English Protestants of the landed or the commercial interest would cherish their prejudices against the Irish Catholic adventurer. In those days one of the ablest men at the common law Bar of England was Mr. Sergeant Shee, an Irish Catholic. For years and years he was passed over when vacancies occurred upon the Bench. The good old maxim: "No Irish Catholic need apply" governed Ministerial patronage over the Bench of England. The Irish Catholic might be sent to India or to some other dependency of the Crown, but the Bench of England should be kept sacred from the Pope. It was an

ostentatious loyalty to the Protestant sentiment on the part of official Liberals. Shee's success at the Bar is easily explained. He was a man of large private means, of exceptional ability and knowledge of law when he got the chance.

His wealth secured the chance; he could wait, he could make friends and become a sergeant when that degree possessed a monopoly of leadership in the Common Pleas, and when the degree was to be obtained by the simple expenditure of considerably over seven hundred guineas. Shee, notwithstanding political services in Parliament to the Whigs, was, as we have said, passed over year after year and could not have been raised to the Bench until at long last the generous indignation of his professional brethren compelled the Lord Chancellor to recognize his merits. This is how things stood when Russell went to the English Bar. With all the advantages which Shee possessed at his start, he only obtained a puisne judgeship. This was a kind of ermined insignificance, a small concession.

With this before him as an object lesson of bigoted unfairness, one must see that Russell possessed unbounded confidence in himself when he left settled chances at home for hardly one in England. It is a condition of success to have this faith in one's powers, but it does not always command success. There are opportunities which must be laid hold of, and it happens that to some the opportunity never offers itself or comes and passes like a shooting star. Russell was at or near the age which the greatest master in the knowledge of men fixed as the period when the practical intellect attains its full maturity. However, it was an undertaking, loaded as he was in various ways, which might cause fear or anxiety to the boldest spirit. A young man, married and waiting for the briefs without an assured income, is in the most trying position one can well conceive. What is he to do while waiting? The etiquette of the Bar is an iron fence which shuts him off from ways of earning support open to other professions. He is separated from the public by the lower branch of the profession. Literature may be an aid, but the writing barrister who does not publish law books or who is not a law reporter is suspected by the attorneys. The publication of a volume of poems was fatal to one man we remember; the suspicion of writing a novel was disastrous to another.

A good book on practice is unquestionably the best recommendation to the solicitors, but this means enormous labor and long waiting for results. Solicitors will respect a man who writes a treatise on some branch of law, but they may fight shy of him as a specialist in opinion without the gifts of a court lawyer until he has proved he possesses them. Their favorite, certainly, is the reporter, but so far as we can judge Russell did not try this exacting and laborious

part of legal training. We are glad of it. He was spared the strain which has been too strong for many a young man whose university career had been a succession of triumphs and whose life in society seemed to fulfil the promise of the past. Reporters have become great advocates and great judges; but how many withering in their environment have lost a man's life and have become an embodiment of collected cases, principles, distinctions and *obiter dicta!* The pride of his class fellows, the darling of society, when the vivacity and hopefulness of manhood in its earliest prime was as a reflection of the promise given by the sun of a high summer day, when the glory of the world of sky and wood, lake and mountain are coming into light, sinks as the years pass into a learned scribe, parchment-faced, stooped, bloodless, the clothing of ten thousand cases. His delight is now the unwinding of a knotty point, his wildest dissipation the effort to distinguish a case in process of development from a current of authority which seems to rule it, to bring under a line of cases one in appearance outside the principle. It is a terrible fate to see what looks like a man a sort of animated mummy of technicalities, yet possessing a special memory vast and well ordered in its possessions as a government library, a penetration in its own walk beyond the insight of mere science men to detect, discover, group. Reporters are useful for all that we have said; they are to be honored, these victims of Juggernaut. They are really the makers of judge-made law, in which we live and move and have our being.

Possibly Russell's intense vitality, like that of the great reporters who became the Chiefs who preceded him on the King's Bench, his indomitable will and his sympathy with the life around him might have saved him from the fate we have sketched. We understand that, with or without the knowledge of the attorneys, he employed literature as an aid. All the same, we have the very best of reasons for knowing that he was in considerable practice as a junior three years after his call to the Bar. When we hear of the ordinary case of a man not touching a brief for eight or ten years we find his career an agreeable exception. Mr. Labouchere, who knew him well, informs us that he was not very generally known until after he was fifteen or sixteen years at the Bar; but this is really not incompatible with a large and lucrative practice for years before the date.

The flashes of repartee, the drolleries of combination which have come from him are racy enough of the soil he sprang from to lead us to hope that one or other of the group nearest him will supply a biography with the good things, the epigrams, the Johnsonian moods to relieve the shadows or tone the sunrays of a soul curiously compact of passion, tenderness, daring and pride. He was Irish from top to toe. It is with a sort of amazement we have read opin-

ions that he could not have been a distinguished success in Parliament. The Bar, we admit, is not the best training school for the House of Commons. Mr. Burke in one of his famous passages explains how it happens that the acuteness, the persuasive power, the command of the resources of rhetoric which obtain forensic triumphs are accompanied with a certain narrowing of the mind due to the application of principles to particular instances of rights rather than to classes of rights and the obscuring of broad, fundamental principles by making them subject to artificial limitations. That this is generally true there seems no reason to doubt, but we have clear and distinct evidence of the strength and largeness of Russell's political philosophy,[4] to which we shall devote some attention if we have space.

We hope, however, that some of those forming his family by blood or affinity, and nowhere could we search for persons more competent, will give the public a biography picturing him in all the moods of feeling and ways of fancy and exercises of power in his home, in society, at the Bar, on the Bench, in Parliament. Epigrams there would be, running fires of sarcasm, airy or scorching, anecdotical resurrections of lifeless stories endowed with a new soul to the surprise and delight of listeners such as we find in the biographies of many great lawyers, and which seem in some way to be revelations of the whole man instead of the sunlit ripple on the surface below which solemn and awful things peradventure lie.

He was all along, despite the claims of that "laborious life" to which he alluded in a passage of great power and pathos in the speech before the Parnell Commission, in the midst of those who would recall with love and pride these phases of his nature or rather scintillations going forth in the exuberance of his nature.

A singularly great and noble one was his, eloquent of his country in all his peculiarities and powers, a product he was of her genius and history. Not an Ulsterman merely, as a writer has said, but a child of the whole land and the memorials studding it. The abbey, the ruined castle, the rath, the storied river and the glen populous with beings the imagination delights in, the romance of certain spots where pride and violence, chivalry and wrong, love and hate played parts that still survive in thought, the old tumble-down town with its fragment of a wall, a stage where crowns were staked and lost, all wrote themselves upon his heart and helped in the shaping of the man for deeds of high emprise. Some one of the gifted group that had been nearest to him should take up the story of his life and tell us all about him: the hidden springs of that noble eloquence, indomitable will, fiery courage, calm strength, fidelity fixed as the deeply

[4] We find that Mr. Labouchere, no mean authority, entertains this view.

rooted mountains. Such a "life" would be more to us than all the masterpieces of biography.

We have been a little long perhaps in speaking of things around rather than in his life; yet they, too, have their use. When a great man has gone from amongst us we look here and there for all the influences that shaped him to be a world-walker through obstructions, as one might say in high Carlylese, or troubled him to action, or led him to the academy or portico, thence to return with the honey of such hives. And sure we are that the domestic, and all but domestic circle of Russell, his family inheritance of cultivation in what is best and the romance and horror of his country's tragedy all had their measure in equipping him for a war with giants. Yet not without interest is it that he pitched his tent after his call to the Bar in that town of England nearest to Ireland, as we may say with substantial if not verbal accuracy. He began practice at the Liverpool Bar, as many others from the Emerald Isle had done and do. There is a considerable Irish population there, men in business worth a plum or two;[5] and conceivably the nephew of the President of Maynooth would be a *persona grata* to them. But then the attorneys: these gentlemen like to look before them to be sure of their man, as it were. It is said his first brief came from Yates & Son. It is something, if true, for this respectable family to remember with pride. The prior of the firm, a clever man actively engaged in municipal affairs, saw something above the common in the young Irishman. We have said something already of the shyness of solicitors in giving business to an unknown or untried man. They will not do it even at the request of a client unless it is a matter in which the young counsel can do no harm. At the same time we know the chance comes strangely and suddenly, very like what is read in novels, but true, as we know, for all that. It is the tide in the affairs of men. It is worth the rest of life; all depends upon it. Let the aspirant take it, grasp it with both hands, as William the Conqueror did England; as Jacob wrestled let the young man wrestle, fight desperately to win, or if losing, fight desperately to the last, unmindful of judicial frown, opponents' sneer, the mild surprise of the unbriefed around him listening with half-understanding ears. If one make £20,000 a year in good time after that chance for thirty years or so, and in a profession which gives a peasant's son equality with the highest man's son, it is worth holding to for all that one may prize in life. We take it Russell's opportunity came in a more prosaic way—good reports of amazing industry, his presence in the Liverpool library, as Mr. Yates, senior, noticed, whenever possible, and so on.

[5] Plum—£100,000.

The more striking way of success may be as follows: A reporter is in his seat, a case is called, counsel is absent, the solicitor is in despair. He turns to the reporter and asks him to appear, endorsing a back sheet for a brief. It may be that that reporter becomes his standing counsel forever after—having shown abundant law and readiness at disadvantage—and that a rush of business from other sources compels him to resign the reportership. Thenceforth he sees the wool sack in his waking thoughts and sits upon it in his dreams—Speaker of the House of Lords and second peer in precedence after the Princes of the Blood, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury being first, of course, in a country of whose Faith the reigning majesty is Defender.

We have seen it stated since the death of Charles Russell that his reading in general literature was not wide and his classical attainments were not high. We have considerable doubt of the correctness of this view, or impression, whichever it may be. It was at one time the fashion to illustrate great speeches at the Bar and in the House of Commons with passages from the Latin poets and from Cicero or Tacitus. For all that Mr. Gladstone was the only man in recent times who adhered to the usage in Parliament; we think Judge Keogh the only man at the Bar. The important thing is, have there been orators whose speeches bear the impress of classical culture? We mean do their style and thought bear the classic spirit and substance? There are only two of whom this can be said, Mr. Burke and Lord Brougham. The first was an English Cicero, greater incomparably than his master; the second an English Demosthenes vastly inferior to his master. Yet the influence of classical and polite literature has gone into the efforts of all the orators, just as it affects the style of any well-bred man, whether he writes a gossiping letter to an acquaintance or frames a state paper in severe sentences. We think there are passages of supreme dignity, power and pathos in Russell's speech before the Parnell Commission. It was said of a certain orator that his speeches were more florid than those of Demosthenes, less so than those of Cicero. The same may be said of any fairly eloquent speech that has been delivered since Cicero. Yet we venture to say there are passages in the speech just mentioned approaching the fierce austerity of Demosthenes; there are passages approaching the richness of diction, and exuberance of fancy which flame like a conflagration in Cicero.

In fact, there was an Olympian environment around Lord Russell all his life—from his infancy until he reached the great place that shall know him no more. The reputation of Dr. Russell, once the President of Maynooth, is of a character not easily estimated out of Ire-

land or England. He united with an intimate knowledge of the living literature of Europe in every department of cultivation a mastery over those stern and high studies which peculiarly belonged to his profession. To illustrate the point: Suppose an Oxford divine's acquaintance with the Greek and Latin Fathers and all that can be known of Church history for the first five or six centuries, suppose in addition a remarkable knowledge of the ecclesiastical and secular history of England in their reciprocal relations, and we have a man of exceptional erudition. Now, in addition to knowledge of this kind, Dr. Russell, of Maynooth, possessed an intimate acquaintance with the entire literature of Germany, France and England.

In speaking of him we are reminded of a remarkable contrast between the manner in which an Irish Secretary spoke of him and the way Mr. Chamberlain spoke of his nephew. Sir Robert Peel[6] was known at one time as an official surpassing the worst traditions of the Irish office in his contempt for Irish Catholic opinion. In the House of Commons he had occasion to refer to Dr. Russell. It was not merely an encomium he pronounced; he acted as if any statement from Dr. Russell should dispose of a controversy in which he was concerned. Place by the side of this Mr. Chamberlain's reference to Lord Russell in the conversation with Dr. Clark. There is some difficulty in writing with patience. Lord Russell had taken the oath of allegiance and the official oath to do justice. He enjoyed the dignity of the peerage, which was always supposed to carry with it such a sense of honor and of public duty that the Lords on a trial before them in which the life of a peer was involved gave their verdict not upon their oath, but upon their honor. It may be said Dr. Clark's statement has not yet been corroborated. We reply it has not yet been contradicted, and we venture to say the matter will not be allowed to rest there. If the Radicals of England have one particle of gratitude for the services of Mr. Gladstone to the cause of liberty and reason, if they will only remember that it was by blow after blow delivered by him to that House whose existence can only be justified by its hatred of the people's rights he obtained for the masses the place in the constitution which they now enjoy, they are bound to render it forever again impossible that Mr. Chamberlain should make his private piques the policy of the Empire.

However, as we have been saying, there was in a manner an Olympian environment around Russell which made his life all along as much in touch with intellectual exertion and the employment of literary work as if he were a young man belonging to the reading set in an university. We therefore doubt the opinion which denied the

[6] Not the great Sir Robert Peel.

extent and quality of his cultivation, nor in doing so are we oblivious of the distinctions of the writer who expressed the opinion. Mr. T. P. O'Connor is himself a man of letters, of admitted ability and of a singular penetration into the solidity of another's attainments. As a rule he would not be imposed upon by the dexterity which makes a large show with comparatively little capital, he would readily enough get below the summer warmth of the surface in pursuit of depths where the treasures should live; and if he immediately struck bottom the public would enjoy a feast and the victim criticized hear something not altogether to his satisfaction. But it is simply impossible that some speeches of Russel could have been spoken by any but a reading man. We have not noticed in the obituaries the divorce suit brought against his wife by French Brewster; and yet the speech delivered at that trial for the poise and beauty of the sentences, the Shakespeare coloring of the home, the truth with which the domestic affections take form as motives preserving the purity of a woman's life and giving strength to her will seems to rank as one of the finished efforts of our day. The difference between the great Bar speeches of the present time and of antiquity is not quite so much in the evidences of thought and reflection appearing in these and expressed in language most carefully chosen. To a large extent the ancients wrote essays which they got by heart and pronounced with all the adventitious aids of the trained elocutionist. The difference seems to be that the modern barrister speaks to the jury only; the ancient one spoke to posterity.

We have spoken of the difficulties before an Irish Catholic at the English Bar. When Russel began they were almost insuperable. Let us be understood. We do not mean that Irish Catholics at that time were absolutely shut out from business, but the business given to them was of an ordinary kind that is simply local and for the most part not involving intricacies of law or large interests. Consequently it could never lead to distinction. Now in Russel's case it was the ante-room to a practice at *Nisi Prius* hardly if ever equaled and to the great places of Attorney General and Lord Chief Justice. This is the highest praise we can give him. There have been and there are[7] Irish Catholics of great ability and legal knowledge at the very local Bar where Russell began. They are never heard of outside their circuit, unless now and then one or other of them is brought up to London on an appeal in a case fought by him in the court below. But this may mean very little.

Again, there was a prejudice against Irishmen who were not Cath-

[7] We have heard that some of these—one certainly—is making £2,500 a year at the Liverpool Bar. The gentleman we have in view is a member of Parliament.

olics. We are strongly of opinion that such Irishmen owed a good deal of assistance to the press, so largely manned by their countrymen. Irish Catholics in the press would be naturally inclined to do a good turn to their Protestant countrymen in the land of the Saxon. It is curious how Irish they are in London, Orange and Green alike. Unfortunately for social and national prejudice, unfortunately for the policy of the *Times*, newspapers could not do without what that insufferable and cowardly snob Thackeray called the Irish army of the press. Well, to these gentlemen whose lines were not always cast in pleasant places Earl Cairns and other Irish Protestants had reason to be thankful for a report or a significant paragraph in their days of struggle. But to help an Irish Protestant in this way was an easy task in comparison to that of lending a hand to an Irish Catholic. Some one at the top would not like the name, so all would end in a quarrel over copy.

If then, as a sympathetic writer said in the *Daily Mail*, we think the lesson of Russell's life teaches how much is due to Ireland's being one country with England—an English county as it were—in possessing so vast a field to ability, energy and ambition, we retort that such qualities would command success independently of the legislative relations of the two countries, and that nothing but the possession of them in the highest degree would command success even in the existing relations. Suppose we had Earl Cairns or Lord Russell on the Irish wool sack to initiate or sustain imperative measures of social and political reform conceived in a spirit of profound enlightenment, adopted to the genius of the people, informed by their history in all the aspects of terror, injustice, violence and fraud which had been sent forth as forces to divide in order that strangers should rule and directed by a sympathy which would make their work enduring, can any one say that for such results the mere elevation of Cairns and Russell in England would be an adequate compensation to Ireland?

For the fitness of both these men to the task of making Ireland a nation—we like the phrase, though it was one of those relied upon to sustain the charge of treason against Mr. Parnell; we like the phrase, yet we are not a traitor; it was made immortal by those orators who watched over the last days of Ireland as a nation, men faithful to her fortunes, faithful in her fall—of the fitness, we say, of Cairns and Russell for such work we have no doubt whatever. As for the first we say with full conviction that his interests, bounded by the four seas of Ireland, his heart stirred by those social amenities which in old days made English residents in Ireland more Irish than the Irish themselves, would have infused into him the spirit of Molyneux, of Swift, of Lucas, the spirit which in Grattan vivifies,

illuminates and disenthrals the land. But in England Cairns was the servant of his own ambition, the lacquey of the Orange Lodge. So much for the Union as opening a career to Irishmen.

But to him who is the subject of this paper we can turn with no merely speculative mind. He was our own. The last of the Irish bards, happily still alive in honored age,[8] imagines the bard of his fancy saying in an ode what will forever echo in every Irish heart:

Owen Roe! Our own O'Neil,

And as Owen Roe is ours, so Russell is; he has a place with the first in the deep heart of the country. Having before us the report of the inquiry by the Parnell Commission, we can only come to one conclusion, that we can never know more than a part of Russell's greatness. It is mainly, indeed, as a political philospher and statesman that the speech in that trial exhibits him to us, but the whole proceedings show him simply as a transcendent advocate, greater in each quality of a great advocate than any one of those men who owed their greatness to the exceptional endowment of a special quality.

He was an advocate indeed, and a great one; but the forensic patron of a client was lost in the protector of a people. Looking at him we see no hired counsel, no briefed gladiator, no Colonel Blood to cut throats in his employer's service; on the other hand, no half-hearted English Liberal, waiting on events while affording his dignified patronage to "incriminated" Irish leaders for so many guineas on his brief, so many guineas each day as refresher, so many each day as consultation fee. We have a particular man in our mind. Owing to this trial the barrister in question owes that influence in the Liberal party which enabled him to betray the policy of Mr. Gladstone for the political aggrandisement of a gentleman to whom Doncaster or Epsom would offer a field for the exercise of his talents more suitable than the House of Lords. This counsel seems to us to have entered on this appalling investigation with the light heart of an Englishman who would take care to gain no matter what face turned up in the dropping of the coin. He would not compromise himself, while at the same time he would be well paid and would hold a prominent place in the sensation of the hour. For all that he did his work well as time went on; but we fearlessly attribute his loyalty to his cause, his apparent conviction of its justice to the magnificent ascendency of Russell, dominating counsel with him, dominating counsel opposed to him, dominating a prejudiced public filling the court—nay, by that ascendency almost arresting the draggonade in Ireland.

These are grave words, but we do not shrink from their expres-

[8] Aubrey de Vere.

sion with reference to the misrepresented circumstances of the time. Malignant influences led to charges irresistible in the judgment of most men in Britain. They were tried by a tribunal created by the Ministry which hoped to profit by them. It was a game in which the accusers and their allies thought they held all the trumps.

The courage of Russell then, overthrowing witness after witness hired against his country, raised his colleagues to the true conception of the issue. It was the Irish nation in the Imperial Parliament that was on trial. It was not the defense of certain men libelled by the *Times*—O'Connell would have thought a libel by the *Times* proof that he had been faithful to the interests of Ireland; any honorable Irishman would regard praise by the *Times* as the judicial punishment of some abnormal wickedness, some enormous sacrilege he had committed, the secret of which was hardly known to himself. No, this was not the issue; it was the impeachment of a rule that had long lain heavily on his people. The agents of that rule through all their classes were then employed in perpetuating it by an unprecedented conspiracy against the Irish representation. The events since should not be allowed to curtain the tragedy.

It is of consequence to England that the dreadful story should be told again. It is due to Charles Russell that the attempt to wreck a sacred cause was defeated. Mr. Gladstone's policy was to bind Ireland and England in a union of hearts. Bitter memories were to sleep, old prejudices to be put away and Irishmen to join with Englishmen in consolidating the Empire and advancing the reign of law and liberty over the world. To prevent this the Irish landlord came, the agent, the bailiff, the rent warner, fresh from the burning homes of the peasantry, the policeman with hands red with the blood of defenseless men and women, the spy and informer from America, whose countless perjuries were the dice with which he played, the spy and informer from Ireland, the incarnation of a lie and the forger whose documents were to link the whole mass of testimony into a chain of inexorable logic.

From the guilt of this conspiracy few men then on the government side can be considered wholly free. The same men rule the Empire now as if that conspiracy had succeeded. Charles Russell is a great loss, but if from his grave he arraigns, as he did at the Parnell Commission, the men who dragged the honor of England in the dust, if gratitude for his services rouse the English people against the enemies of Ireland and sends them once more on Mr. Gladstone's road of justice, the sting shall be taken from death, he will live in the memory of his race. We hope for this consummation. Charles Russell was as faithful to those sound principles which would enlarge the rights and liberties of the English masses

as to the fortunes of his native country. The policy of Mr. Gladstone meant not alone justice to Ireland, but equal rights to Englishmen. His aim was to make all men politically equal, so that an opportunity to work out individual and social elevation should be within reach of the poor man's son. The privileges which hedge round those who toil not were in his expectations to be no bar to humble merit. The lever for this was the granting of a quasi-autonomy to Ireland. No more able ally he had for this policy than Russell. No more effectual blow in advancing it than when Russell put in the same eternal pillory the Ministers of the day, the syndicate or corporation called the *Times*, Beach[9] and Pigott.

In adopting as a Liberal the policy of Home Rule, Russell flung on the table the great stake of his career. If he had ever looked forward as the result of exceptional eminence at the Bar to attaining the place of Attorney General, experienced men would have thought he flung the hope of it aside when he took up this policy. To identify himself with the national policy of Ireland a Catholic expecting to be Attorney General must have fancied that the settlement securing the succession of the House of Hanover was a myth, the Revolution an interesting fiction. This is really the attitude of mind of the average Englishman. Russell could not have been ignorant of this. We can fairly conclude that he deliberately closed the gate on his own career for the sake of Ireland. Thinking seriously of all this, we can only stand in awe before the greatness of Gladstone, putting under his feet the insolence and pride and prejudice of generations of Englishmen, crystalizing in that one appointment his belief in the justice and wisdom of his policy. It was the extreme test of its righteousness that the Catholic was not helot, the Irishman no stranger in the British Empire.

We had intended to illustrate the marvelous duel between the great counsel and the spy Beach, the cross-examination which reduced to pulp the wretched Pigott, to say a word or two about the speech which saved the fortunes of Ireland in that darkest hour, but however interesting we cannot essay the last. It would be well worth the best exertions of the painter in words or in colors to put before us the scene in Probate Court No. 1 on the 22d of October, 1888, when the Commission entered on its labors. Since Burke opened the impeachment of Hastings there was no such scene in England. When as Manager for the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled our great countryman impeached the proconsul of India in the name of all venerated influences, in the name of Divine laws and of human codes reflections of the Divine, there listened beneath the roof of Irish oak the most august tribunal, the

[9] Le Caron was the traveling name of this spy.

most brilliant audience in the world. Yet it was only a pageant—suggestive of vast imperial power indeed—but a holiday performance with the trappings and majesty of justice over a corpse galvanized into temporary life by the genius of Burke. Except in his speech we see nothing of the marvelous history of India, mysterious, wonderful, infinitely varied, principalities and powers going back to the dawn of time, a village life unchanged for thousands of years, courts that were old before the Norman came to England, religions whose source was hidden in the foundations of the world. This great scene lives on canvas and on the pictured page, but affords not one tithe of the instruction one would derive from a word picture or a painting of the first day of the Parnell Commission.

The elements of Irish society were there in the flesh, anachronisms of far centuried life pulsating with the hopes and passions of the nineteenth century all welded into a kind of hetrogeneous homogeneity the like of which had never been seen will never again be seen. Each element has a significance of social change, each would be to the philosopher an illustration of a phase of political existence concerning which theory or inference was the extent of his knowledge. There were peasants in a costume worn before the Danes came to Ireland, worn when the City of the Tribes was still a great emporium for the trade of France and Spain and its walls a bulwark against Norman barons and Celtic chiefs, peasants who had not yet shaken off their belief that the landlord owned their lives as absolutely as when their ancestors fought or died at the bidding of chief or baron. There were yeomen instinct with the spirit of the eighteenth century when they and their landlords smuggled, distilled, fought and stood shoulder to shoulder against the King's writ; but now in some dim way trying to think the thoughts of freemen and articulate the language of any justice save the landlord's will. There were squires of the same century in all but dress, any one of whom could have sat for a picture of Lord Eyres as we know him in Mr. Lecky's great work, casting insolent glances round the court, scowling when some priest made his way with bent face through the press, whispering each other with ferocious scorn or encouragement as some shame-faced peasant was pushed forward to perjure himself for their benefit. Here and there in green uniform the terrible gendarmerie—confident, collected, threatening, as in some Petty Sessions Court at home—mingled themselves among the witnesses.

This was a large part of the assemblage—disentombed tragedies of Irish history—for the rest, a hostile court. We say it with respect, for the act constituting the court rendered it impossible for the Commissioners to be otherwise, a prejudiced public, and so we

have a subject for the exercise of the highest idealizing skill in the grouping and characterization of verbal painting like that in which Macaulay puts before us the trial of the great delinquent Hastings.

There would be in such a picture a place for one or two figures expressive of the union of hearts aimed at by the great leader whose adoption of the cause of Ireland was the essential reason of the trial; there would be a place for Mrs. Gladstone, who watched the fortunes of Ireland as Sir Richard Webster and Sir Charles Russell fought from day to day.

Le Caron or Beach turned inside out—a monster of perfidious cunning—made men begin to think that a cause buttressed by such support stood self-condemned. The wave of public feeling began to turn, and with the fall and flight of Pigott the tide rushed on with resistless power. Sir Charles was morally triumphant along the whole line. The result was felt in the House of Commons. The Tories sat cowed on their benches, while the Liberals sat like men maddened at the thought that they had been deceived into countenancing the systematic falsehood of their opponents and its fruit in the atrocities of the then regime in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone was in the House, he rose to speak in language made possible by Russell's advocacy and concluded in words that may serve as a memorial of the great advocate: "You may deprive of its grace and of its freedom the act which you are asked to do, but avert that act you cannot. To prevent its consummation is utterly beyond your power. It seems to approach at an accelerated pace. Coming slowly or coming quickly, it is surely coming. And you yourselves, many of you, see in the handwriting on the wall the signs of the coming doom."

GEORGE MCDERMOTT, C. S. P.

New York.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI AND THE RELIGIOUS REVIVAL IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

AT a time like the present, when the Church is in the throe of a new development in history, and when with the dawn of the twentieth century she has to face a new world of ideas in life, social, intellectual and political, it is instructive to look back over her past history and seek an intelligent guidance from the lives of those who have already contributed to the Church's greatness. "It is only a fool who learns from his own experience; a wise man learns from the experience of others," is a reported saying of the

German Bismarck. The study of the lives of the men who have made a people great is a wise precaution, especially at periods of quick development and necessary unrest such as we live in to-day. The movements which in the past have shaken the Church and finally brought to her new life, leave an indelible mark upon Catholic character which it would be fatuous to ignore at any subsequent period in history. For example, in the further development of Catholic thought which will mark the immediate future Catholics cannot afford to ignore the work already accomplished by the Christian Neo-Platonists and the Scholastics. The notion, not unfrequently broached in these days, that Catholic theology should now cast scholasticism behind it as a thing forever done with and useless, is historically untenable; a community cannot get rid of its history in that fashion any more than a man can get rid of his past life with all its moulding influences. So, too, in regard to the interior and mystical life of the Church there has been, and still is, a continuous development; a tradition, constantly unfolding from the days of the Catacombs to the present: the Holy Spirit working in the Church for the fuller realization of the Christian life.

This constant movement of life goes on universally in the Church, affecting the lives of the humblest members who are at all earnestly concerned with their religion, but it manifests itself typically in certain individuals, the spiritual giants of our race, who by the intensity of their character give point and body to the vague instincts and undefined convictions of the multitude.

Thus a St. Augustine becomes the centre of a widely scattered group of thinkers and apologists who think as he thinks, but have not his clear perception nor his power of expression; and a great intellectual movement thus becomes identified with his name. In his writings, too, the excelling genius of the movement will naturally be found.

Now, in the development of the moral life of the Church there is one period which for some time past has attracted the most sympathetic interest of students of Church history, both outside the Church and within; though it must be acknowledged that as in much else concerning Catholicism, so in this, the impetus came from outside. In the life of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries students have discovered one of the finest presentments of Catholicism, both moral and intellectual, but especially moral. It is the period when Catholic piety manifested itself in a most intense realization of Christ's earthly life and in chivalrous devotion to His sacred humanity: the age of the Crusades and of the Crib. It is to be noticed that at a period marked by strenuous speculation in the Christian

schools, tending to a cold rationalism, there blossomed forth this intense devotion to the earthly, concrete Christ—the Man-God of the Gospels and of Tradition—and that the moral reformation which saved Christendom in the thirteenth century was chiefly connected with this development of piety.

Of this movement the classical expression is St. Francis of Assisi, the moral and social reformer, whom Pope Innocent III. saw in vision upholding the tottering walls of the Church. And the interest aroused in the history of the movement has resulted in a vast quantity of literature dealing with the life of the saint and his influence on his contemporaries. Not the least valuable result of this literary activity has been the republishing of the ancient "legends" or memoirs of St. Francis, written by his own friends and companions. For centuries these precious documents, unique in the history of Catholic literature, were hidden away and almost forgotten. About half a century after the death of St. Francis discussions arose among the members of his order as to the interpretation of the rule which he had given them. The more zealous members appealed to the "legends" in support of their contention against those who were anxious for relaxation. The authorities in the order desired to put an end to division by compromise; but this the "zealots," as the upholders of the primitive austerity were called, would not hear of. In order to overcome their opposition it was decreed that the "legends" should be destroyed—a drastic measure which it is difficult to condone. Fortunately some copies were preserved. The most ancient of the "legends"—the "First Legend by Thomas of Celano"—was published by the Bollandists, as was also a fragment of the "Legend by the Three Companions," which is a compilation of personal recollections by the saint's three most intimate friends. In 1806 the "Second Legend by Thomas of Celano," a supplement to the "First Legend," was again given to the world by a learned Franciscan friar.

This "Second Legend" threw light upon several doubtful points in the received "lives" of the saint and gave rise to a more critical study of the sources already recovered. But it was reserved for the last two or three decades of years to see the outburst of a world-wide interest in the study of early Franciscan literature. As already noticed the impetus to this study came in great measure from outside the Church, and it is only just to acknowledge the debt we Catholics owe to non-Catholic efforts. And to no one is greater praise due than to M. Paul Sabatier, whose "Life of St. Francis of Assisi," published in 1894 and translated into most European languages, has done much to make the saint and the mediæval revival connected with his name known to the world. M. Sabatier's work

had many defects arising from a somewhat distorted view of the action of the Papacy in regard to the Franciscan movement; but he was able to make St. Francis live in the imagination. He did still better work in editing the long-lost "Mirror of Perfection: The Blessed Francis," the greater portion of which was written by Fra Leone, the saint's most cherished companion. M. Sabatier is now engaged in preparing other primitive Franciscan documents for publication. Not less valuable have been the labors of two friars of the order, Padre Marcellino da Civezza and Padre Teofilo Domenichelli, who lately edited the entire text of the "Legend by the Three Companions," the most delightful of all the "legends."

The value of these discoveries in confirming the popular cultus of the saint cannot be exaggerated. We can now see Francis as he appeared to those who knew him most intimately, and the result of this increased knowledge is to deepen our reverence and love for his name. "Those that loved him before may love him better now. We knew him saintly and human. We find him more human and saintly than we knew. The more clearly we see his features, the more clearly may we trace their likeness to those of the Man of Sorrows. It is the likeness of close kindred, the mystic likeness that once seemed a peril and has always been a glory to the Church of Christ."[1] Yes, in these original documents Francis stands out with a glory brighter than ever. His features, faithfully limned by his own companions and personal disciples, are more Christlike than we find them in any of the later biographies. These have generally drawn the saint as they conceived he should have lived: by deepening the shadows here and heightening the colors there, they have often caricatured and even falsified the saint's true features. The Francis of the later biographies is like an ancient masterpiece of art restored by inferior hands. But in the primitive "legends" we have the real Francis. To be sure, he is ever the hero and the saint and no common man in the mind of the writers; but then he really was a hero and a saint. With charming simplicity they relate what they heard and saw. There is no attempt to criticize, for they are disciples of a great master and they write with the candor of faith. They do not think to hide his human infirmities or temptations; these do not detract from his moral grandeur. They evidently do not think him the less a saint because he was more a man. To them he was verily a prophet sent by God to form a "chosen people" whom God had called out of the midst of religious laxity and degeneration, to bear witness to the true character of the Gospel; another Abraham, father of a mighty spiritual race that should endure unto the end of time. No less than prophet and patriarch

[1] Preface to the "Mirror of Perfection," by Sebastian Evans.

was Francis to them, and with delightful simplicity they found parallels in Scripture to apply to the saint and his religious family. The Chapel of the Portiuncula is another Jacob's stone; the promise of God to Abraham is repeated to Francis; the followers of Francis are the new Israel. But in Francis the Old Law is transfigured and becomes the New. He bears the character not of Abraham nor of Moses, but of Christ. Assisi is as Bethlehem, Alverna as Calvary, Umbria as Galilee. In the company of Francis they seemed to themselves to walk with Jesus in the far-off Holy Land.

How all this worked out in daily life may be read in the "Legend by the Three Companions," of which the following extracts are a specimen:

"The Blessed Francis, being already filled with the grace of the Holy Spirit, called unto him his six brethren (this was, of course, in the very earliest years of the movement) and spoke to them of the things that would happen to them, saying: 'Let us consider, my brothers, our calling, wherein God has mercifully called us, not for our own salvation only, but for the salvation of many others; that going forth into the world we may exhort other men, more by example than by word, to do penance for their sins and be mindful of the commandments of God. Fear not because you seem weak and foolish, but without faltering preach simply penance, and put your trust in God Who conquers the world, because by His Spirit He speaks in you and through you, for the exhortation of all men, that they may be converted unto Him and observe His commandments. And you will find some men believing, gentle and kind, who will with joy receive both you and your words. But many others you will find unbelieving, proud, and blasphemous, who will resist you contumeliously, both you and the words you will speak to them. Therefore lay it up in your hearts to bear all things humbly and with patience.' Now when the brothers had heard these words they began to fear. To whom the saint said: 'Fear not, for after no long while many will come to you, learned and noble, and with you they will preach to kings and princes and many peoples, and many will be converted to the Lord Who will multiply and increase His family throughout the world.' And when he had said these things and blessed them, the men of God devoutly went forth, observing what he had taught them."

This was the first missionary journey of Francis' disciples. They went two and two, after the fashion of the Gospel, in various directions; nor were they long in experiencing the various receptions foretold by the saint. Some received them with the reverence and affection due to holy men; others took them to be tramps and assaulted them, pelting them with mud and even stripping their

clothes from their backs. Such treatment must have been peculiarly trying to men of sensitive temperament like Fra Bernardo, the saint's first disciple. But they bore all patiently, "according to the Gospel, praying fervently and solicitously for their persecutors." At the end of their missionary period they all returned to Portiuncula, outside Assisi, and says the Legend: "No sooner did they meet each other again than they were filled with such joy and sweetness as to forget altogether the injuries of perverse men." The Legend then gives us a glimpse of what we may call the friars' home-life.

"Every day they gave themselves to prayer and manual labour that they might altogether flee idleness, the enemy of the soul.[2] They rose in the middle of the night and prayed most devoutly with sighs and tears. They loved each other with an intimate affection, and each served the other and cared for him as a mother loves and cares for her only son. So great was the charity which burned in their hearts that each one would have deemed it an easy thing to give his life, not only for the love of Christ, but for the salvation of the soul of his brother, and even to save his body. Thus it happened one day, when two of the brethren went out, that a madman met them and began to throw stones at them. Whereupon one brother, seeing that the stones were hitting the other, at once threw himself in the way, willing that he himself should be hit rather than the other, so great was their mutual love. Thus were they prepared to give their very lives for each other.

"So grounded were they in humility and charity that each reverenced the other as his father and lord, and those who were superiors or who were in any way distinguished above the others, appeared only the more humble and unassuming. Moreover, they were all anxious to obey, and were so ready to carry out the will of him who commanded that they never thought to distinguish between just and unjust precepts; because whatever was commanded they took to be in accordance with the will of God. Hence it was easy and sweet for them to obey. They put from them all carnal desires. They judged themselves without indulgence, and especially did they beware lest they should in any way offend each other. And if it happened at any time that one said anything which hurt another, he was seized with remorse and could not rest till he had acknowledged his fault. . . . No one of them considered anything as his own; their books and whatever else they had were for common use, according to the tradition handed down from the apostles. But, although they themselves were truly poor, yet out of the things God had given them they liberally and ungrudgingly, for the love of God,

[2] This phrase, "*idleness, the enemy of the soul,*" was frequently on the lips of S. Francis, and occurs several times in his Rule and Last Testament.

gave to others, especially the poor who sought an alms. Sometimes when they were traveling and met beggars, having nothing else to give, they would share with them their garments, sometimes giving away their hood, sometimes tearing off a sleeve: that so they might fulfil the Gospel which says, Give to them that ask.

"When the rich ones of this world came to them, the brethren received them readily and with kindness, being anxious to draw them from evil and lead them to penance. They were anxious not to be sent to their native places, in order to be free from the company and conversation of their relatives; thus observing the prophet's words: 'I am become a stranger to my brethren and as an alien to the sons of my mother.' Thus did they rejoice much in their poverty, . . . and they were joyful in the Lord at all times because among themselves there was no cause for sadness."[3]

No wonder that Jacques de Vitry, traveling through Italy in A. D. 1216, in the early days of the Franciscan movement, was struck with astonishment at this new body of men and women whose life recalled to him "the manner of life of the Primitive Church, concerning which it is written: 'The multitude of them that believed had but one heart and one soul.' "[4]

Surely in the whole history of Christendom since the days of the Apostles themselves, there has been no such another evangelical movement as this. Never has the world seen such another dramatic setting of the Gospel, played with such fidelity in the minute details of daily life. It was too sublime really for general acceptance. As the number of Francis' disciples increased (and they increased with surprising rapidity) the first high fervor waned. There were still some who walked on the high road of Francis' heaven; but the majority could not attain thereto. Historians lament the decline of the movement. Need we be surprised? The life of Francis and his early disciples was an inspiration rather than a set rule of life. Other men of less spirituality came after them, who aspired to walk in their footsteps. Most frequently they followed only at a distance; yet the world has been the better even for such a following as theirs. The humblest follower of Christ is still a witness to the Christ, even though he point to the Christ from afar off, and were he to disappear the world would oftentimes be lost in utter spiritual darkness. We must be grateful when Providence sends us the greater

[3] "Legend by the Three Companions," chaps. x. and xi. [4] This letter of Jacques de Vitry is most valuable to the student of the early Franciscan movement. But its significance will easily be exaggerated unless we bear in mind that it is the letter of a traveler giving his impressions. M. Sabatier has, it seems to me, done violence to the text when he draws the conclusion that the religious Sisters of the order were "sœurs hospitalieres," and not contemplatives, because Jacques says: "They dwell together in various hospices; they receive nothing, but live by the labour of their hands." But this is quite consistent with the contemplative life. Francis did eventually enlarge the scope of his order, so as to include women devoted to a more active life.

lights of religion; but let us not despise the lesser lights who are more constantly with us.

Besides these humbler, but honest, disciples of Francis, there were others who called themselves disciples—and they were not a few—who seemed destined to subvert, if it could have been subverted, the noble ideal of Francis' life. They saddened the saint's last years; after his death they well nigh brought the Franciscan movement into contempt. They gathered round Francis like moths around a lamp. They were not of his; they only usurped his name. We may therefore leave them to their fate in the contempt of history, and fix our gaze upon the pure and heroic figure of the saint himself. For by doing so we shall be able most surely to understand the spiritual motive which lay at the back of that wonderful religious revival of the later middle ages.

Renan, in whose mind truth jostled so intimately against error, had long ago singled out St. Francis as one whose personality has a religious message for the present age; and in his brilliant critique of Karl Hase's "Franz von Assisi" puts his finger upon the secret of the saint's influence, both in his own age and in the present. "Francis of Assisi," he wrote, "possesses for religious criticism an interest beyond expression. After Jesus, no other man has been endowed with a clearer conscience, more absolute ingenuousness, a more lively sentiment of his filial relation to the Heavenly Father. God was in very truth his beginning and his end." Then after pointing out how the life and character of Francis transcends our ordinary conception of life so far as to be almost incredible, and that nevertheless we have incontestable documentary evidence to prove it, he proceeds: "Francis of Assisi has always been one of the strongest reasons which has made us believe that Jesus was nearly all that the Synoptic Gospels have painted Him to be." In this last sentence we believe Renan has expressed in somewhat pedantic fashion the weightiest argument for Francis' popularity. Francis is a unique witness of the Person of Christ. The study of his life makes one realize the beauty of the perfect Christian life and its possibility; for here in a mortal man like ourselves, without any claim to divinity, we have a character so supremely Christlike, that the Gospel itself, in the light of his history, becomes an actual palpitating truth, convincing beyond any argument drawn from speculative reason. After all the most persuasive argument for Christianity is the living Christian. Yet even when we have admitted this, we can hardly be said to have given a satisfactory answer as to the secret of Francis' influence in the Christian world both in the Church and outside; nor can we be said to have given any sufficient reason for assigning to him, as many do assign to him, a special influence

upon the further development of spiritual life in the Church of the future. Conformity to Christ is always the lever of spiritual power in the Church; but this conformity must not be merely of external life, but of the interior spirit. The real Christian embodies in himself the Truth of Christ, not simply the outward action; and it is in the degree that he helps us to realize truly and understand the very life and thought of the Sacred Humanity of Jesus that he is a permanent factor in the development of the Christian life.

Now we believe that the most potent claim of St. Francis to the reverence of the Church is that he in great measure solved in his own actual life the difficulty which has always faced, and still faces, earnest souls as to the apparent duality of life. From the very beginning, at least since men began to look into their own souls, human nature has seemed to be the battleground of two irreconcilable forces, each of which seems to claim the proper allegiance of man, and each of which seems necessary in opposition to the other. So that man's nature has seemed to be an essential contradiction, and the only way to obtain interior peace has seemed to lie in sacrificing one element to the other. Yet, on the other hand, the instinct of the Church has been opposed to this view. She admits the apparent contradiction, yet points to a further development of man's being in which the contradiction shall exist no more, and yet the apparently opposing elements shall be retained. How to harmonize the natural and supernatural, the temporal and the eternal, has always been the crux of philosophers; Christianity has given the only satisfactory solution. Yet how few Christians realize it! In St. Francis of Assisi, however, it has been realized in a notable degree, and it is in this fact that his power lies. In him religion and all that was best in the world-life of his time met and intermingled in a rich harmony; in him it may be said with truth the world-spirit of the middle ages took flesh and blood and was indissolubly allied to religion.

It has been sometimes urged against mediæval Christianity that it retained a great measure of paganism in its spontaneous delight in the visible world and in its worship of the palpable Present, whilst at the same time religion was held to represent something apart from the Visible and the Present. So that, it is urged, the life of the middle ages was a dualism; Sense and Spirit being the two poles of a perpetual antagonism. We must, however, admit that if our mediæval forefathers were conscious of this dualism, they had also an idea, more or less vague, that this dualism could be resolved into a deeper unity, as is evident from the manner in which they were able to bring their delight in the sensuous into the religious liturgy. In doing so they manifested a belief that harmony between the

spiritual and the temporal is possible, however dimly they may have realized this harmony in actual life. They might not be able to reconcile the two terms of life; but they believed reconciliation possible. Their healthy instinct preserved them from that subtle form of Manichean heresy which has been so prevalent since the middle ages. Puritanism in all its forms (and we must bear in mind that Puritanism went beyond the Puritans) banned nature from the realms of grace, as an evil spirit is banned from heaven. But nature when thus banned is apt to become a troublesome enemy. The joy of life is not found in outcasting one of life's constituent elements. Mediæval Christianity recognized all the elements of human nature, from an instinctive belief in their essential harmony; and this instinctive belief was vindicated by Francis in his own personality. He was, in fact, the hoped-for Messiah in whom the promise of the mediæval spirit was realized. The patient belief that life's apparent dualism (represented in scholastic phrase as nature and force) did but hide a deeper essential unity (also represented in scholastic phrase as regenerate nature) was realized in Francis. He was a manifest embodiment of regenerate nature. Others beside him realized this belief in their own inner life, as any one acquainted with mediæval biography knows; but Francis did so on a larger and more generous scale.

He had indeed the natural genius which enabled him to do this. Of a poetic temperament he was quick to take note of the beauty of all created forms and to recognize a universal kinship between himself and all creatures, whether man or beast, or the very elements. He lived, so to speak, in them, and their life was part of his. The flower of the field and the running brook sent him into an ecstacy of delight; he seemed to understand the mute language of the beasts; he would sing for very joy because of the mysterious beauty of the sun and stars. His soul moved in all the grand elemental forces of nature as the soul of the musician delights in the complex harmonies of the symphony. He was a poet, with a poet's largeness of heart vision and intimate sympathy. But he was more. He was of that rare order of men to whom a right intellectual concept or an intuition is a moral conviction. Such men do not so much sing of truth or beauty as act it. They are themselves embodiments of the beauty and truth which they behold in the world outside themselves; in them the best that the world can give is mirrored and expressed. Such men are not merely artists: they themselves are an inspiration of art, and the value of their inspiration is in proportion to the generosity of their sympathy. Francis' sympathy with the world outside himself was indeed great and generous, as any one can learn who will but open the "legends" of the saint—

now easily accessible to all—or the *Fiorretti*, that wonderful supplement to the historical narratives, embodying the traditions and impressions of a somewhat later age.[5]

Now this sympathy with nature in its various creations was the very groundwork of Francis' religious life. With his poetic intuition he could never have acknowledged that nature was the work of the devil. In him the mediæval belief was strong that God and nature are allied, and that to love nature is to worship the Creator. He had an intuitive conviction of the great Catholic truth that the Divine is revealed in the Creaturely. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein"—such was the song that the heart of Francis perpetually sang. It was the chant of his worship both before and after his "conversion."

It was towards the end of his life that he composed his "Song of the Sun," an unmetrical string of verses in which he praised the Creator for the beauties of the creation. But this was only a more conscious rendering of the religious sentiment of his youth.[6]

Francis' conversion was, of course, the leading incident in his life, both historically and from the point of subjective analysis. He was in his twenty-fifth year and full of the ambition of youth when he fell sick of a fever. He was only just released by the Perugians, having been taken prisoner in a battle fought between the "patriots" of Assisi and the robber-nobility, who were assisted by the neighboring republic of Perugia. As soon as he was convalescent he longed once more for the freedom of the fields and the hills. But to his vast disappointment when he went forth the country had lost its charm, and he returned home with a chilled and stricken heart. Again he mingled in the civic revelries and led the light-hearted youth of the city as had been his custom; but the sunshine had gone out of it all, and in the midst of the fun Francis was sad and listless. The fact was that during his sickness he had been brought face to face with the thought of eternity; and the thought had taken hold of his soul and given him a new vision of life, or rather it had clouded the simplicity of his former view of life as a present enjoyment, and he could not yet grasp the mystery that had taken its place. He felt lonely in the midst of his former life; its joys had fled when the reality of eternity had first dawned upon his mind. Slowly and with much anguish of spirit which at times caused him to go out of the city to some solitary cave, and there cry aloud for very pain, Francis

[5] See especially the twelfth part of *The Mirror of Perfection*, which treats of "His love towards creatures." [6] This song is supposed to be one of the earliest efforts in Italian literature. Generally St. Francis composed his songs in the language of the Provençal troubadors. The "Song of the Sun" takes its name from the verse coming immediately after the stately prologue. It begins:

Laudato sia Dio mia Signore contute le creature,
Specialmente *messer lo frate sole.*

came to see the truth. He had now become conscious that there is a duality in life; that the temporal and the eternal, the secular and the spiritual, are two actualities. Hitherto he had professed this belief, and now he realized it. This realization it is which precedes any spiritual conversion. One must perceive life as a contradiction before one can attain to any perception of the deeper spiritual unity. It is the way in which the human mind is accustomed to work.

To such a man as Francis, so sensitive to the beauty and joy of life, the perception of any essential, or apparently essential, contradiction between the temporal and eternal, must be the acutest pain. He was ever too much alive to allow himself to be comforted by the belief, generally adopted by men of less spiritual energy, that things will right themselves somehow. For him to live, was to live in the full consciousness of the realities around him. Life might be a contradiction; then he must drink the cup of contradiction to the very dregs. Or beyond the contradiction of life there might be a higher truth and more essential unity; if so, such a man as Francis will discover it. It was the same problem as presents itself in the fascinating legend of the founder of Buddhism; but in Francis how differently it worked out. The solution as it came to Francis may be stated thus: "The eternal begins in the temporal; time is the seed of eternity. What you see to-day with your eyes is not wholly true, neither is it wholly false. Nature in so far as it is not spoiled by man, is the germ of heaven; the beauty you delight in to-day is the promise of a greater beauty hereafter." Thus was Francis reconciled again with the visible world, from which the consciousness of eternity had for a time separated him. But the reconciliation was not yet complete. The visible world had gained with him a new reality; it had become part of the eternal; at least there was in the visible world the beginnings of eternity, mixed up with much that was a mere perversion of the original creation. Something was yet necessary to bring Francis into actual touch with the realities of his new spiritual vision, so that he might not be a mere stranger wandering through the Father's Kingdom.

Never, as far as we know, had Francis felt the need of total self-surrender. He had enjoyed life with the irresponsible enjoyment of youth. This was no longer possible. Had he been other than he was, or had his realization of the eternal been less intense, it might have been possible for him to regain touch with the facts and duties of life by taking to himself a wife or attaching himself to some great leader of men. Some such surrender of oneself to a personality other than one's own is necessary to every man who would live in actual spiritual contact with the world around him. Such is the law of human life. But no ordinary love was able to bring Francis

into touch with the greater world now opened out to him. He must surrender himself to Christ only and for Christ's sake renounce those lesser ties which bind lesser men to the realities of life. He must renounce all for Christ, as under other circumstances he might have had to renounce all for some chosen woman's sake.

When this inward call made itself manifest, Francis was once more happy. He no longer went aside from his friends and groaned for the solitude of his soul. In surrendering himself to Christ he had again found the joy of life, only now it was a deeper joy—the joy born of an extended vision and of a deep personal love. He was once more at home in creation; but creation had now a larger aspect and a deeper significance. The vision of truth which was within his soul cast itself upon the vision of beauty without, and mingled in inexpressible delight. There were shadows there, wrought by man's sin, especially by luxury and selfishness. But the vision of earth which Francis now saw was one of essential delight. And with all this Christ had put him into immediate relationship, because Christ was the centre of it all. It was Christ's own kingdom. The glory of the earth was Christ's glory; the sorrow of the earth, too, was Christ's. Love of Christ therefore meant love of all creation, especially of all mankind.

The intuitive apprehension of this truth is the explanation of Francis' subsequent career and of that widespread movement which for a period brought back to earth the primitive spirit and conditions of Christianity when men forsook all for Christ and learned from Christ how to love one another. This evangelical revival, which realized the yearnings and hopes of all the best spirits of the later middle ages, was remarkable chiefly in that it reconciled the religious spirit of the age with all that was best in the secular spirit. The reconciliation was brought about by a fuller appreciation of that central mystery of the Gospel, the Incarnation, and its influence upon life in general. In the Incarnation Francis saw the reconciliation of the world with God, a reconciliation which implies that of the secular spirit with the religious, of temporal interests with the eternal. But in Christ he also saw how this reconciliation is brought about only by suffering and renouncement. This is the cost man has to pay for making an idol of the Present and Visible and separating it from its proper relationship with the Unseen and Future. Not until Francis became impressed with the reality of the other world had Christ any real significance to him as the Reconciler of this world with the Father. At the same time the Incarnation taught him to give the visible creation a positive value, fraught as it is with eternal verities. With Francis renunciation was but the stepping-stone to a larger life; it gave him freedom to satisfy his

spiritual aspiration and it likened him more closely to his Master, Christ. His renunciation of wealth and comfort had in it none of the Puritan's belief in the wickedness of nature. Even to the last he could appreciate the spirit in which ordinary mortals make merry at the dinner board over the meeting with a friend. He would order the knight Orlando to go and entertain his guests, when the knight himself thought it becoming to converse on spiritual matters with the saint. His religious songs were couched in the style and phrase of the troubadour. He saw nothing improper in applying the titles and style of chivalry to his own disciples. The friars were on his lips, "God's Knights of the Table Round;" St. Clara and her companions were "fair ladies of Poverty;" he himself was "the herald of the Great King." He was, then, no hater of the world; he loved the world for what was good in it; he pitied it with a gentle sorrow for what was evil. The evils of the world were the thorns which tore the bleeding feet of God's fair creation. This generous sympathy with all creatures it is which makes Francis so like unto Christ. Others have renounced the world for Christ's sake as completely as did Francis; others have preached to the world and ministered to its wants, spiritual and temporal; but few have so utterly appreciated and sympathized with the world as Francis did. In this he is almost unique. Not more truly did the impression of the five stigmata on his body mark him out as Christ's special follower than did his Christlike love of the world.

In his passionate love of Christ Francis again realized in the highest degree the aspiration of mediæval piety, which as Harnack has pointed out[7] found its first great expositor in St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and its complete expression in the Poor Man of Assisi. To attach oneself to Christ and to follow Him in all the humble estate of His earthly life—this was the ideal of the middle ages, especially of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was an ideal which appealed at once to the imagination and the heart; and the secret of all great moral movements lies in the appeal to the imagination and the heart.

I doubt whether people brought up outside the Catholic Church can appreciate what such personal devotion to Christ meant to those mediæval revivalists. To them Christ was an ever-present Reality, without Whom there was no reality, but only vanity and disappointment. He was the unifying principle of creation; everything visible received a permanent value only in so far as it proclaimed the beauty and truth and love of Christ's spiritual kingdom. Hence they sought for vestiges of Christ's presence everywhere, and every discovery increased their joy because it bore witness to the fact of

[7] "History of Dogma," Vol. VI., chap. 2.

Christ's presence among them. Thus Christ was the bond which united them to all external objects. Now Protestantism, whilst professing to be an evangelical reform, effectually severed this bond of direct spiritual relationship with Christ which was alike the secret of primitive Christianity and of mediæval Catholicism. The Reformers declared that the Catholic Church with its sacraments and dogmas had come between the soul and Christ; but they themselves created a barrier which experience has shown to be impassable in their worship of the Bible. They at once reduced Christianity to the servile observance of a moral code in place of that personal attachment to Christ, spiritually conceived by the believer, which mediæval Catholicism in its best representatives endeavored to foster. The influence of the rationalizing party among the Schoolmen undoubtedly tended to base Catholicism exclusively upon an intellectual assent to certain formulæ. And, too, there were the mediæval ritualists who in their multiplication of ceremonies tended to forget the significance of the symbol and to reduce religion to mere externalism. Oftentimes they put the jeweled cope in place of the clean heart, and sang psalms when they should have been teaching the poor. These were the abuses of the mediæval Church against which many a reforming spirit had protested long before Luther. But the constant teaching of the leading lights of the middle ages—of such men as SS. Bernard, Bonaventure and Aquinas—was that true religion depended upon communion with Christ as a present spiritual Personality. Only a few might attain to this intimate communion in any high degree; but all were urged to strive after it. To them the Bible was of value only in as far as it gave them some glimpse of the life of Christ, either in His earthly career or in His spiritual working, as the Divine Word, in the hearts of His chosen people. What they sought was, in a word, the Personality of Christ, that they might conform themselves thereto. The Reformers, on the other hand, did as many modern nations which have taken to themselves a written Constitution, and govern by conforming to the letter of the law rather than by fidelity to the national ideal. Hence to the mind steeped in sixteenth century Protestantism, the religious life of St. Francis and his mediæval compeers is as unintelligible as is the English ideal of free government to the peoples of the Latin race.

Perhaps nowhere is the character of the mediæval devotion to Christ more vividly expressed than in the dramatic poem, "Amor de Caritate," sometimes, but erroneously, ascribed to St. Francis,[8] and more generally supposed to have been written by the friar-poet, Jacopone da Todi. The poem describes the surrender of the soul to

[8] The style of the poem is evidently of a somewhat later date than the opening of the thirteenth century.

Christ and gives utterance in the unrestrained style of a decadent period to the idea of mediæval devotion:

"I asked, not knowing, when I prayed,
For love of Christ; it seemed so sweet.
Methought in peace I should have stayed."[9]

But the soul finds the love of Christ a consuming fire. It can find no peace now in mere creaturely delights. Heaven and earth do but cast the soul back upon itself with the sharp admonition:

"With all thy heart love thou the love
Which has created us that we
Might draw thy spirit heavenward
To love Him Who hath so loved thee."[10]

And so the soul finds no peace except in entire self-surrender. Then

"Transformed by Christ, with Him made one,"[11]

the soul gains a new life and joy. It

". . . . . is made
The likeness of its Lord to bear;"[12]

and in its new life indeed no soul-peace but the soothing ardors of a great love.

"In Christ I'm newly born again—
The old man dead, the new restored;
And whilst my heart is cleft in twain,
Transfixed by love as by a sword,
My spirit, all on fire, would fain
Behold the beauty of its Lord."[13]

This beholding of the beauty of the Lord, or more correctly, of Christ all beautiful was the supreme ideal of the mediæval religious spirits. The beauty of Christ was the dream of their life, and it must be added that the sorrow of their life—a sorrow which finds expression nowhere more pathetically than in the life of Francis—was that the beauty of Christ was marred by the world's sin and misery. Sin to those mediæval disciples was no mere disfigurement

---

[9] Inanzi ch'io provasse, domandava
Amor a Christo pensando pur dolzura;
In pace di dolzezza star pensava.

[10] Che celo e terra grida et semper clama,
Et tutte cose ch'io dibbia amara,
Lascuna dice: Cun tutto core ama,
L'amore che n'ha fatto briga d'abbrazzare;
Che quel amore perzo che te brama,
Tutto nui hà fatte per ti à se trare.

[11] In Christo transformata quasi e Christo
Cum Dio unita tutta stà divina.

[12] De Christo se retrova figurato.

[13] In Christo e nata nova creatura,
Spogliata homo vecchio, e fato novello;
Ma tanto l'amore monta cum ardura,
Lo cor par che se fenda cum coltello,
Mente cum senno tolle tal calura;
Christo se me tra tutto tanto bello.

of a passing world; it was rather a gaping wound in the body of Christ. As Christ is spiritually united with the whole world in intimate relationship of joy and sorrow, so the world's evolution was to their mind an extended drama of the life of Christ. Christ Himself was glorified in the pure heart, in the patient and in the just and in all the extension of His moral kingdom. He was also crucified again in the world's suffering. The stricken leper, the hungry beggar, even the broken flower, were incidents in the mystery of Calvary. Hence to the mind of Francis suffering had a peculiarly religious significance. To him it was the price of the world's redemption. Through suffering only could man attain to the perfect state; whoever would be of Christ must suffer with Christ the penalty of the world's sin. Like Christ Himself, Francis would willingly have borne, had it been possible, the world's burden upon his own shoulders; have suffered its pain and endured its varied wretchedness. As it was, his soul melted with compassion for his fellow-mortals. He welcomed all his personal pain because it identified him more and more with the suffering Christ and his suffering fellow-creatures. Days and nights he spent in prayer beseeching the Divine mercy to pardon a sinful world. He himself became an apostle, and willed that his friars should become apostles, to spread abroad the knowledge of God's love to comfort the sorrowful and to preach repentance for sin that Christ's passion might not be in vain nor the world's suffering misery unending. In sin he saw the source of all suffering; in penance and reformation of life, the remedy. With this conviction he put aside the idea of living a hermit's life and became a religious and a social reformer. "The world's suffering and Christ is still crucified in the world. Let us go forth and preach the Gospel of Divine Love and Eternal Life, that men may be stirred to put aside selfishness, hate and luxury, which are the cause of the people's misery." Such was in effect the precept he gave his disciples on the memorable day when he sent them forth to be evangelists, "to preach to the poor and heal the broken heart."

Such then was Francis of Assisi, the most Christlike of saints, and such was the character of the evangelical revival associated with his name. Rightly to appreciate him, one must, as we have already pointed out, view him in connection with his own time. He was typically mediæval, of the thirteenth century. Yet in the circumstances created by his own time he solved the question that has puzzled many souls in every age, and not least in our own. He discovered in religion a unity and perfection of life, a harmony of life's varied realities, such as the present world with its long tradition of Manichean duality is hungering for. It was said that he who would find heaven must leave the earth to the devil; that to take delight in

the world that is, is to forfeit the heaven that is to be. For a time men tried to live by this doctrine with consequences sometimes heroic, sometimes hideous, according to the temperament of the individual and his circumstances. The doctrine produced a Cromwell and his hearts of iron—no mean advantage to a demoralized nation such as the England of the seventeenth century—but it also gave us the prime hypocrite and the soul-stricken gospeler of a later time. The revolt against so sore a heresy was sure to come in time. When it came there was danger of the Present and Visible being idolized and put in place of God Himself. Yet if Christianity teaches any truth at all it is that man is to look forward to another life and another world. Other-worldiness is the essence of Christianity. At the same time it has consistently fostered an appreciation of the Present and Visible, differing from that of ancient Greek and modern Pagan, because it teaches us to look through the Visible to the Invisible, through the Present to the Future. This world is the step to eternity. We are not to sit down and make ourselves comfortable on the step, but to pass over and enter in.

Francis of Assisi explains the problem on the mediæval background of his. He does not give us a direct solution of the problem in its modern details, but he gives us a key wherewith to work out the solution for ourselves. This key is a realization of and a personal devotion to Christ in His relationship with the world, and a Christlike love of the world. I say *Christlike love*, because there is another love which has for its patrons Epicurus and the leaders of the Pagan Renaissance, and in these days of catch phrases it is well to mark the significance of one's words. The evangelists of the thirteenth century, inspired by the life of Francis, would have had little to say that was pleasant to such love as this. Not Epicurus, but Christ, was their ideal; and how their endeavor to give effect to their belief brought to the world for a while something of the glow of undiluted Christianity can be known by the perusal of those early "legends" written by St. Francis' personal disciples and now once more published to the world.

As I have already said, it is well for us Catholics in the midst of the evolution of modern life and its necessary influence upon the life of the Church to keep in mind the heroic figures of the past. They have many a lesson to teach us which will be of value to us in these days, and save us perhaps much trouble and waste of energy. The Church of the future has its own work to do; it cannot afford to lose sight of the work already accomplished. A neglect of the history of the past would only entail greater labor in the days to come.

FATHER CUTHBERT, O. S. F. C.

Crawley, England.

SOME HETERODOXIES AND INCONSISTENCIES OF RUSSIAN "ORTHODOXY."

NOT long ago an indubitably Catholic journal in one of our Western States, a journal which is not one of those weaklings which are so wanting in Catholic stamina and in proper knowledge that their demise would benefit the Catholic cause, told its readers in an editorial that "the Russian Church is not heretical; it is *merely* schismatical." Such an assertion would not have been astounding, if emitted by that leading secular journal of the metropolis which, on the occasion of a recent attempt at theological excitement, showed that its religious editor was incapable of distinguishing the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin from the divine origin of Jesus, or from a supposed virginity of St. Ann.[1] But so important an error on the part of a professedly Catholic journal, one which has shown itself to be well equipped for a defense of Catholic truth, and which has battled for that truth more successfully than very many other American Catholic organs, might add to the material for a future volume on "The Curiosities of American Catholic Literature," were it not too true that similar misconceptions concerning the Greek Schism and its offshoots have found lodgment in the minds of perhaps the majority of our people. Russia, as well as the other lands where the spiritual progeny of Photius languishes, is very distant from us. Until recently very few of her sons came to our shores, and very few even of our more educated Americans have cared to know anything about the spiritual condition and the religious history of her children. Then we have been accustomed to hear that the Russian Church "is almost Catholic;" or that "it is Catholic in everything, save the Pope;" or the real truth that "it has a true episcopate and a true priesthood, the Holy Mass and all the Seven Sacraments;" and the more simple-minded among us have come to believe implicitly, certainly not explicitly, that perhaps after all the poor Schismatics are about as well off spiritually as is the obedient flock of him to whom Our Lord and Saviour said: "Feed my sheep!" Again, comparatively few among us have had anything like an accurate notion of the meaning of the word "Schism," unless in its philological sense; and hence it seemed quite natural to think of a Russian as only or *merely* a Schismatic, one who might not be on the straight road which Christ indicated as

[1] This genius probably had for his Gamaliel that theologist of Agnosticism, James Anthony Froude, who discovered that when Pope Pius IX. proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, "by one stroke of his pen he made St. Ann a virgin."

leading to heaven, but who, at any rate, skirted the road, and who, with a little care, might avoid the ditches at its sides. We heard, now and then, of some unfortunate priest who disobeyed his bishop, and who, followed by some poor ignoramuses or perhaps by some problematical Catholics, set up a little "Catholic Church" of his own. We pitied the poor schismatics, and in time we saw them all returning to the obedience of him who was commissioned by the Vicar of Christ; but in all such instances we failed to apprehend the deep significance of the term "Schismatic" in the sense in which it is applied to, and deserved by, the "separated churches of the East." The great misery of all the Oriental Schismatic churches, including the Russian, the principal one, is found in the stubborn fact that each of them is historically and theologically *heretical.* The poor man, or set of men, who simply refuse to obey the authority divinely established in the Church, may be merely *schismatical;* but they who absolutely deny the supremacy of the successors of Peter are heretics purely and simply, since they deny an article of Catholic faith. Again, the "Orthodox" Russian Church is heretical because it denies the Catholic dogmas of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and from the Son;* of the existence of Purgatory; of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady; and of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. The time was when there was no great need for an accurate perception of this truth by the Catholics of this republic; but now that large numbers of Russian and Greek Schismatics are dwelling among us, too frequently mixing with our Catholic congregations, and not seldom causing dissension among them (whether as emissaries of the Holy Synod or not, we are unaware); now, we insist, our people should be taught the wicked absurdity of which they would be guilty, were they to palliate the heinousness of rending the seamless garment of Christ by the cherishing of such a thought as that expressed in the asseveration: "The Russian Church is *merely schismatical.*" Reflections such as these have prompted us to dilate to some extent on the heterodoxies of which Russian "Orthodoxy" is culpable, and upon some of the flagrant inconsistencies into which its heretical blindness and obstinacy have led it.

One of the principal grievances of Russian "Orthodoxy" against the Roman Church is found in the fact that the Mother Church administers the Sacrament of Baptism by "infusion" instead of by "immersion." Both the "Orthodox" and the Constantinopolitan Schismatic theologies hold that immersion is *probably* of the very essence of valid baptism; and therefore, say all the separatist Eastern Christians, the efficacy of the Roman rite of baptism is at the best problematical. Thus, in the reply to Gagarin's "Will Russia Become Catholic?" written by Karatheodori, physician to the Sultan of

Turkey, under the title of "Orthodoxy and Popery," we are told that "the baptism of the Latins is not a true baptism," although, strangely admits the medical theologian, "it may be adopted in case of urgent necessity." The same doctrine, we are told by Gagarin, one of the most learned and judicious of the modern converts from the Russian Establishment, is inculcated in many works which have received the approbation of the Russian Holy Synod; and we know that after the rupture of the reunion of the Eastern Schismatics with the Catholic Church which the Council of Florence had effected in 1436, and after the deposition of Isidore, the Muscovite patriarch who had signed the Act of Reunion, his successor decreed: "The Russians must rebaptize all Roman converts to their faith, since the Westerns baptize only by infusion, a condemnable practice which renders the rite null and void." But, strange to say, in the face of this opinion of the Holy "Orthodox" Church, and despite the tremendous importance of baptism in the minds of Russian theologians, it is not the custom of the "Orthodox" clergy to insist on a rebaptism, even on a conditional one, of such Catholics and Protestants as embrace the Photian Schism. None of the German Protestant Princesses who enter the imperial Russian family, not even the one who becomes Czarina, is asked to submit to what "Orthodoxy" pronounces essential to her status as a Christian; she is simply required to declare her adhesion to the Holy "Orthodox" Church of Russia, even though there is very great probability that, owing to the not uncommon carelessness of Protestants in the essentials of the baptismal rite, the "converted" lady is a mere pagan. The clergy of Holy Russia are not shaken out of their supineness by the fact that some day the possibly pagan Czarina, like that Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst who became the infamous Catharine II., may become in time the Russian Pope as supreme mistress of their Holy Synod; they know that the lubricious "Semiramis of the North" was not rebaptized when she married Peter III.; and the fairly well-read among them know that Catharine avowed to the sycophantic philosophist, Voltaire, that the Russian Church does not rebaptize its converts from Catholicism or from Protestantism.[2] In our own day there have been instances of wholesale so-called "conversions" to the Russian Establishment on the part of Polish Catholics, thanks to the knout, the bayonet, starvation, fear of Siberia, and, above all, to treachery and chicanery;[3] and in no instance were these "converts" rebaptized, thanks to Peter the Great, the institutor of the Holy

[2] On December 27, 1773, O. S. (January 7, 1774), Catharine wrote to Voltaire, who had alluded to his impression that the "Orthodox" rebaptized their converts from other Christian denominations: "As head of the Russian Church I cannot allow you to persist in this mistake. We do not rebaptize." [3] See the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXIII., p. 194 *et seqq.*

Synod, who by virtue of his autocratic power abrogated the decree of the Patriarch Jonas, thus opening to many a perhaps unbaptized Protestant the way to the priesthood and even the episcopate in the Russian Church. It is worthy of remark that the more intellectual among the "Orthodox" clergy have frequently appreciated the significance of this inconsistency, especially when they reflected on the more consistent practice of the clergy of the Constantinopolitan Schismatic Patriarchate, from which they pretend to derive their origin, and with which they communicate; they have endeavored to explain away the contradiction in a very curious fashion. Thus, in the *Causérie Ecclesiastique*, a periodical published by the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg under the very eyes of the Holy Synod, we read in the issue of September 17, 1866: "The Greek Church (Schismatic) admits willingly the *validity* of baptism given by infusion; but it demands from converted Latins a new baptism in order that it may draw a well-defined line of demarcation between the Greeks and the Latins—in fact, the Greek Church so dreads a possible reconciliation with Rome that it has thought it wise to make the Greeks believe that the Latins are in no sense Christians." It is amusing to note that the famous William Palmer,[4] while still involved in the mazes of the English Royal Establishment, discovered that if he wished to become a Constantinopolitan Schismatic a trip to St. Petersburg would dispense him from a rebaptism. "There is a way out of the difficulty," he wrote; "a trip to St. Petersburg will settle the matter. I can join the Russian Church without being rebaptized; then I can go to Constantinople, and since the 'Orthodox' and the Greek (Schismatic) Churches communicate, I can be admitted to the sacraments and even to the priesthood at the hands of His Greek Œcumenicity."[5]

No less striking than that in reference to baptism is the inconsistency of the Russian "Orthodox" Church in regard to the dissolubility of matrimony. According to the olden doctrine of that Church, just as according to that of its pretended source, the Schismatic Greek Church, a consummated Christian marriage can be dissolved only because of adultery; but in practice there are now one hundred and ninety-five cases in which the tie of marriage may be nullified. One of the most interesting modern instances of this flagrant inconsistency was that of the divorce of the Grand Duke Constantine, brother of Alexander I., from his wife, Anna Feodorowna.

[4] William Palmer, one of the luminaries of the Oxford Movement, characterized by Dean Church as "a man of exact and scholastic mind, well equipped at all points in controversial theology," was perhaps most famous for his attempt to effect a union between the Russian and the Anglican Establishments. His efforts resulted only in his being told by the Greco-Slavonic heretics that he should be reconciled with his own patriarch, ere he extended the olive-branch to the separatist patriarchates of the Orient. He became a Catholic in 1856.

[5] See Palmer's "Eastern Question," p. 10.

Not a soul breathed a word against the matrimonial fidelity of the Princess; the state of her health compelled her to live apart from her husband; and he had fallen in love with the Countess Grudzinska. On March 20 (April 2), 1820, Alexander I. made known to all his subjects that the Holy Synod, "relying on the precise text of the thirty-fifth Canon of St. Basil the Great, declared that the marriage of the Grand Duke and Czarwitch, Constantine Paulowitch, with the Grand Duchess, Anna Feodorowna, was dissolved, and that he was free to contract a new marriage." It would be interesting to know how many members of this Holy Synod, this servile creature of the autocrat, were acquainted with the life of one of the glories of the Greek Church—St. Theodore Studita, who flourished at a period when the Eastern Churches were still devotedly attached to the communion of the Apostolic See. When the Greek Emperor, Constantine VI. (Porphrogenitus), having discarded his wife and contracted a "marriage" with his concubine, Theodota, was upheld by a conciliabulum of courtier prelates like those who are the slaves of the Protasoffs, etc., of our day, Theodore protested against the legalized adultery, and from his dungeon he wrote to the Father of the Faithful, Pope St. Leo III.: "Since Our Lord Jesus Christ confided the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to Peter, and afterward conferred on him the dignity of Prince of the Apostles, it is our duty to make known to the successor of Peter such innovations as are introduced into the Church of God. . . . Oh divine superior of all superiors! There has been formed here, according to the expression of Jeremiah, an assembly of prevaricators and a meeting of adulterers." But the members of the Holy Synod were then, as they have ever been and still are, of calibre diametrically contrary to that of the Studita; as for the support which they pretended to find in a Canon of St. Basil, it is evident that just as in the case of the Grand Duke there was no question of adultery, so in the adduced canon there was no question of divorce, but simply one of a more or less grave ecclesiastical censure to be visited on spouses who separated "from bed and board."[6] But instances like this of Constantine Paulowitch are in-

[6] The text of the Canon is thus given in the "Juris Ecclesiastici Græcorum Historia et Monumenta, Jussu Pii. IX., P. M., Curante J. B. Pitra, S. R. E. Card." Tom. I., p. 592:

Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ καταλειφθέντος ἀνδρὸς ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς, τὴν αἰτίαν χρὴ σκοπεῖν τῆς ἐγκαταλείψεως· κἂν φανῇ ἀλόγως ἀναχωρήσασα, ὁ μὲν συγγνώμης ἐστὶν ἄξιος, ἡ δὲ ἐπιτιμίου· ἡ δὲ συγγνώμη τουτῷ πρὸς τὸ κοινωνεῖν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ δοθήσεται.

The following is a free but accurate translation: "If a man has been abandoned by his wife, the reason for the abandonment must be investigated; and if there seems to have been no just reason, the husband will deserve indulgence, while the wife will merit punishment the indulgence toward the husband consisting in his not being segregated from the communion of the Church." The judicious Oratorian, Lescœur, in his valuable work entitled "The Church in Poland" (Paris, 1876), tells us that he compared the Greek text with the Slavonic of the *Kniga Pravil*, or Book of Canons of the Russian Church, and with the *Kormtchaia Kniga* used by the Holy Synod in 1820: and that he found the three versions agreed.

significant when compared with the consequences of a ukase of Nicholas I. permitting new marriages to all Catholic wives whose husbands had been sent or would be sent to Siberia, to prison, or to forced labor in the mines—providing, of course, that they would promise to raise their children, future and already born, in the Church of the State. The reader who accompanied us in our investigations into the martyrdom of Poland from the days of Voltaire's "St. Catharine" to the advent of the present Czar, and who is therefore able to appreciate the iniquities of the great majority of the "criminals" who have languished in Russian penal establishments, will understand how widespread would have been the desolation if most of the Polish women had not been worthy of their Catholic ancestors. We would merely note that by the provisions of his matrimonial ukase Nicholas I. simply enforced the principles of modern Liberalism regarding the competency of the State, and the incompetency of the Church, in matrimonial causes—principles which an American proconsul has recently actuated in Cuba, in illustration of the beauties of a new "civilization," and which were interpreted for the benefit of Pope Gregory XVI. by Count Gourieff, Russian Ambassador at the Vatican, when in a memorial *ad hoc* presented to the Pontiff in May, 1833, he impudently asserted that "the pretensions of the Catholic Church in regard to matrimony constitute an attack on the prerogatives of the State, and that the efforts of the Roman Court in behalf of those pretensions are mere attempts to actuate certain enactments of ancient Councils *which have now fallen into desuetude.*" Such inanities as these of the little diplomat call for no attention. Let us rather use some of our limited space for a few observations on the manner in which the Canon Law of "Orthodoxy" came to recognize the one hundred and ninety-five causes for dissolution of matrimony which are unknown to the Divine and to the original Russian Ecclesiastical Law. In every age of the Christian era, just as in the days of the Old Law and of Gentile Paganism, the conflict between the ecclesiastical and the civil power has been perennial; and such it will be until the end of time, since the average human ruler will ever refuse to act as though he recognized that between him and his subjects there is always extended the ordaining and guiding hand of God. Rulers like Charlemagne, St. Edward, St. Louis IX. and Garcia Moreno are seldom granted, even to Christian peoples. Thus the Eastern Emperors, even while the Eastern Patriarchates were still devotedly bound to the Chair of Peter in ecclesiastical and filial communion, frequently pretended to a right to arrange matrimonial causes according to their momentary whims. Justinian, by his *Novella 117*, admitted six reasons for divorce in favor of a husband and five in favor of a

wife, in spite of the fact that even the Eastern Church, when it mistakenly relied on a false interpretation of certain verses of St. Matthew, allowed divorce only in the case of adultery. Then, just as in later days in the case of the United Greeks, the Holy See could only protest, and exclaim: *"Ipsi viderint."* But the condemnation was launched against this violation of the law of God, and the obstinate and puerile Orientals could enjoy such satisfaction as may be derived from continuing a practice which is reprobated by the Vicar of Christ. In time the sins of the Lower Empire merited for it the usurpation of Photius, the imperial sword-bearer; and when governmental brute force had detached the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate from the communion of the Catholic Church, the intruder compiled a new code of Canon Law which he designated as a *Nomocanon*, and in which he incorporated all the *Novellæ* of Justinian. From that day the canonists of the Constantinopolitan Schism, and those of all the derivatives of that Schism, have accorded a place, aye, even the first place, to the matrimonial ordinances of a civil government. Nor should we forget that Photius augmented the matrimonial consequences of the Justinian *Novella* by the addition of three new causes for divorce; for that matter, the Canon Law of the Wallachian Greek Schismatics admits three others. And we must note that the most recent Collection of Canon Law received by the Schismatic Greeks, the one compiled by Rhalli, the president of the Athenian Areopagus, under the auspices of the Holy Synod of the governmental Hellenic Church (1856), opens with the *Nomocanon* of the disreputable Photius, and eulogizes the reprobate in most extravagant terms. From these observations the reader will understand the readiness with which the Holy Synod recognized the Nicholaite one hundred and ninety-five causes for the dissolution of the matrimonial tie, when it failed to breathe a word of disapproval of them, and allowed the "Orthodox" clergy to bless the unions which were contracted in accordance with the imperial dispensations. It is true that these privileges of Satan were ostensibly granted to the Poles alone; but we fail to comprehend how an autocrat can possess religious jurisdiction over one portion of his "thrice blessed subjects," and not over all of them. Nor can it be said that the case of the hundred and ninety-five dissolving causes was a matter of the civil law. In Russia the civil and the ecclesiastical law emanate from the same source; the civil and ecclesiastical autocrat cannot be supposed to regard his civil and his ecclesiastical enactments as mutually destructive; and when the "Orthodox" priests perform a religious rite with the consent of the Holy Synod, that tribunal must be supposed to approve the act.[7] However, we

[7] For details concerning the matter of imperial interference in matrimonial causes in the

cannot drop this subject of Russian Cesarian usurpation in matters of matrimony without an admission that in our day there have been many abuses by Polish Catholics in the matter of divorce; there have been adduced nullifying reasons which were deliberately ignored by the contracting parties at the time of the marriages. But we must remember that in the premises there is one great difference between the conduct of the "Orthodox" Schismatics and that of the Catholic Church, namely, the protestation which the latter, when suffering because of human passions, never fails to emit. The Catholic Church is never derelict in this matter, even though the blood of her bishops and priests must necessarily flow in consequence of her steadfastness. In 1830, when Poland still had a semblance of a National Diet, that assembly heard the courageous protests of the Polish bishops against the frequent violations of the Ecclesiastical Canons in matrimonial causes, and it was in spite of those protests that supposedly nullifying reasons were relegated to the consideration of the civil tribunals, and that the apostolic zeal of Gutkowski, Bishop of Podlachia, and of Skorkowski, Bishop of Cracow, entailed upon them dismissal from the capital before the dissolution of the Diet.

The great "reformer" of the Muscovite Church, and also its greatest robber, was the Czar, Ivan the Terrible; and according to him the foulest error of the "Western heretics" was the shaving of the beard. In an edict which this Head of the "Orthodox" Church issued in 1551, being unaware that another Russian Supreme Pontiff, the "great" Peter, would one day enact the contrary, he proclaimed that "the effusion of a martyr's blood would not atone for this crime." However, with all due respect to the memory of the terrible Ivan, the modern clergy of Holy Russia agree with their cousins of the Schismatic Constantinopolitan Patriarchate and with the derivative Churches of that separatist organization, in the declaration that the prime justification of the Photian rebellion must be found in the fact that the Roman Pontiffs had confirmed the "heretical" teaching according to which the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* from the Son. In fact, the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *alone* is the cardinal dogma of the "Orthodox" belief. And nevertheless, in the most important official act which the Russian Establishment has performed in modern times, namely, the declaration of the Holy Synod dated March 25, 1839, whereby certain apostates from Catholicism, certain United Greek bishops of Lithuania, were received into the communion of the Russian Establishment, no recantation of "the most damnable Latin

days of the Eastern Empire, the reader may profitably consult Perrone's "De Matrimonio Christiano," Vol. III., p. 397, *et seqq.* Rome, 1858.

heresy" was demanded from the "converts." The sole requisite for an admission to the yearning embrace of Holy Russia was a renunciation of obedience to the Pope of Rome. Listen to the text of the Synodal declaration: "Their solemn profession that Our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, is alone the veritable Head of the One and True Church, and their promise to persevere in unity with the holy orthodox patriarchs of the East and with this Holy Synod, leave nothing for us to demand from these members of the United Greek Church in order to effect their true and essential union in the faith; and therefore nothing prohibits their hierarchical reunion with us. Therefore the Holy Synod, by virtue of the grace and power given to it by God the Father, by Our Saviour Jesus Christ and by the Holy Ghost, has resolved and decreed," etc. And then the Holy Synod warns the "converted" prelates not to trouble their flocks, whom they hoped to drag with themselves into the vortex of the schism, with questions of mere "local significance," things which "involve neither dogma nor sacraments." Can it be that the Holy Synod would have asked the innocent and ignorant to believe that an exterior and public manifestation of the nature of the belief in the Procession of the Holy Ghost was a mere matter of "local significance, which involved no dogma?" Truly this act of the Holy Synod was both cowardly and (according to its faith, if it had any) sacrilegious; and when the brigandage of Chelm, which we have elsewhere described, almost destroyed the remnants of the United Greek Church in Russia, there was observed what the powers of darkness must have regarded as the same "prudent silence." How different this course from that pursued by the Holy, Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which receives no convert into its pale, let the person be ever so humble or ever so exalted, until he or she has abjured not only every dogmatic error in general, but also the specific errors of the forsaken creed!

Plato, metropolitan of Moscow, probably the most illustrious churchman whom Russian "Orthodoxy" has produced during the nineteenth century, was once asked by a Western concerning the teaching of his Church on Purgatory; and the prelate replied: "We reject the doctrine of Purgatory as a modern invention, excogitated probably for the sake of money."[8] And this assertion, a delectable morsel for the average Protestant, is dinned into the ears of every "Orthodox" student, despite the notorious fact that almost the principal revenue of the Russian priests is derived from prayers for the dead, and although the Russian "Particular Catechism," the work of Philarete, metropolitan of Moscow, inculcates the propriety and even the necessity of that practice.

[8] Lescœur: "L'Église et La Pologne," Vol. II., p. 504.

Not the least strange among the inconsistencies of Russian "Orthodoxy" is the hostility which it manifested toward the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady; it is strange indeed, since the principal monuments of the Eastern Church are so redolent of testimonies in favor of the doctrine, that it may well be said that if Pius IX. had proclaimed its contrary, the Holy Synod would have denounced him as a heretic *ex alio capite.* However, the author of "Orthodoxy and Popery" avers that in the dogmatic definition of Mary's great prerogative, the Roman Church "manifested its unbridled love of change, of movement, and of innovations in the domain of a faith which is eternally unchangeable by its very nature." And, nevertheless, this author tells us that according to the Eastern Church the Blessed Virgin "was exempt from the effects of original sin"—an avowal which is so true, that any reader of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* will perceive that His Holiness relies chiefly on the testimony of the Eastern Fathers for the establishment of his thesis. This same "Orthodox" author knew very well that one of the chief complaints of the Russian Starovere heretics against the Holy Synod is to the effect that this would-be authoritative tribunal renounced, in 1655, the ancient belief of the Christian East in the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God. The same author must have remembered that in the seventeenth century the ecclesiastical Academy of Kiev, speaking through Lazarus Baranowitch, Bishop of Tchernigow, regarded that doctrine as indubitably true;[9] and we can scarcely imagine that the Academy could have deemed otherwise when it was accustomed to hear, among other and innumerable evidences furnished by the Russian Liturgy, that passage of the Office for the Nativity of the Virgin: "We proclaim and celebrate thy birth, and we honor thy Immaculate Conception."

We shall merely touch the manner with which the "Orthodox" Church treats the secret of the confessional. The awfulness of the subject, and the notoriousness of the sins of "Orthodoxy" in this regard, excuse us from dilation on the matter. In 1854 Snagoano, a Greek archimandrite, who gloried in his communion with "the holy patriarchs of the Orient," published in Paris a work on "The Religious Question in the East," from which we cull the following passages: "The Russian Church is simply a schism, because it has separated from the great Eastern Church; because it does not recognize the Patriarch of Constantinople as its head; because it does not receive the Holy Unction from Byzantium; because it is ruled by a Synod, over which the Czar is a despot . . . and *because Confession, instituted for the betterment and the salvation of penitents, has become, through the servility of the Muscovite clergy, a mere instrument of*

[9] Gagarin: "L'Église Russe et L'Immaculée Conception." Paris, 1876.

espionage in the interest of Czarism." That this accusation is well founded has been demonstrated for the enlightenment of those who have had no extensive experience in Russia, by Tondini[10] and by the "Orthodox" author of "The Raskol."[11] The latter writer tells us that "there is an ordinance which compels each priest to reveal to the government every plot against it which may come to his knowledge in the confessional." And this ordinance is in accordance with a ukase issued by Peter "the Great" on February 17, 1722, enjoining the taking of the following oath upon every priest of the "Orthodox" Church: "I will denounce and reveal (all conspiracies) with entire truthfulness and without any disguise or palliation, having in my mind the fear of losing my honor and my life." Certainly the term "inconsistency" is too mild to serve as a qualification of such sacrilege on the part of the priests of a Church which holds, at least theoretically, the same views concerning Sacramental Confession that are taught by the Church of Rome. However, this abject cowardice and diabolical treachery is but natural in an organization in which the civil power takes no pains to disguise its tyranny over the ecclesiastical, and in which the clergy manifest no shame because of their groveling, but rather consider it a matter of course that they should give to the autocrat the blind obedience of a soldier.

The "Orthodox" Church claims to be a divinely instituted organization, empowered to labor for the eternal salvation of men, and resolved to accomplish its task in spite of the influence of earthly power, when that power is hostile to its objects. Did it not claim such origin, endowment, and intention, it could not present itself as the Church of God. We pass, for the present, the matter of the origin of the Russian Ecclesiastical Establishment; now we would briefly consider its course when it finds itself confronted by the civil power. "It would be easy," remarks Lescœur, "and it has been done a thousand times, to multiply proofs of the absolute degradation of the Russian sacerdotal order in its relations with the government. Were we to examine all the grades of the hierarchy, from the pretended Holy Synod which is servile when it is silent, and more servile when it speaks, down to the humblest village pope; from the Universities and the privileged convents where are trained the few distinguished governmental candidates for bishoprics, or for diplomatic posts, or for the general run of the public offices, down to the miserable convents of men or of women, in which there languish wretched beings without piety or charity, and which are inevitably homes of ignorance and vice; everywhere we would find the same conditions produced by the same cause—the subordination, or rather

[10] In his commentary on "Le Reglement Ecclesiastique de Pierre le Grand," p. 248. [11] "Le Raskol, Essai sur les Sectes Religieuses en Russie," p. 236. Paris, 1859.

the absolute effacement of the religious element, absorbed by the civil power."[12] Even in purely theological matters, the "Orthodox" episcopate and priesthood have seldom or never been able, if willing in rare instances, to withstand the governmental pressure. When Peter "the Great," following the counsels of the Genevan, Lefort, to whom he owed the invention of the Holy Synod, tried to demi-Protestantize his Church, he found his clergy, his seminarians, and even his bishops, so subservient, that when the Lutheran, Frederick Lütiens, dedicated his curious book to the Grand Duke Peter Feodorowitch (afterward Peter III.)' he felt justified in congratulating the Prince and his bride (the future Catharine II.) on the fact that "the glorious Peter had so restored and modified the modern religion of the Russians in accordance with the Scriptures and with the rules of the primitive Church, that he had made it as similar as possible to that of the Evangelico-Lutherans."[13] And the Lutheran was able to support his assertion by quoting the text of the Catechism which had been compiled by the "Orthodox" bishop, Theopanes Procopowitch, the prelate whom Peter "the Great" had employed to draw up his "Ecclesiastical Regulation." In this Catechism, declared Lütiens, "we find the purest Evangelical doctrine on the forgiveness of sin, on justification, and on the eternal salvation which is attained by faith in Jesus Christ alone."[14] And when, in 1807, the court of St. Petersburg had tired of its playing with Protestantism, and felt the necessity of resuming its comparatively closer connection with the primitive Church, did it turn to its bishops for the accomplishment of the restoration? By no means. The imperial "supreme judge of the Holy Synod" appointed a mixed commission of ecclesiastics and laymen, according to it absolute control over the curriculum of each seminary; and in this commission there were numbered merely a few bishops, and they were all favorites of the court.[15] But the Holy Synod perceived no insult to itself, no usurpation of the things of the sanctuary, in this imperial pretension; it was as ready then to abrogate every ecclesiastical prerogative as it was in 1830, when, in order to aid in the final destruction of agonizing Catholic Poland, it took from the seminaries 20,000 seminarians, declared them forever debarred from the priesthood, incorporated them into the army, and sent them to evangelize the Poles in the fashion which we have seen recommended and adopted by Siemaszko.[16] There is one instance of abjection, however, on

[12] *Loc. cit.*, Vol. II., p. 468. [13] "Dissertatio Historico-Ecclesiastica de Religione Ruthenorum Hodierna." 1745. [14] For more information on this subject, see the already cited work of Tondini, Gagarin's "Etudes de Theologie et d'Histoire," Vol. I., p. 56, and De Maistre's "Quatre Chapitres Inédits sur la Russie," ch. 3. Paris, 1859. [15] See Gagarin's "Clergé Russe," p. 135.| [16] The reader need not be surprised at this treatment of the seminarians by the Holy Synod; for during many centuries the Russian Church has not known the meaning of the phrase "ecclesiastical vocation." In Russia the priesthood has been, until very recently, as

the part of the "Orthodox" clergy, which perhaps speaks more eloquently than those which we have indicated. In every Russian liturgical service at which the litanies are recited, not only the name of the Czar, but that of the last little baby of the imperial family, is mentioned before the existence of the Holy Synod is recognized. But hearken to a few of the abject phrases used by the Holy Synod; we cull them at random from some acts of the tribunal: "Conformably to the most exalted will of His Majesty, the Holy Synod has undertaken to better the condition of the provincial clergy—By order from above, many monasteries have been deprived of their rights of fishing—The bishop of Kursk is allowed to print his sermons—His Majesty has found it wise to dissolve the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools, and to confide their direction to the Holy Synod, charging the supreme procurator (always a layman, and generally a soldier) with the execution of its orders—By a decision of the Imperial Council, confirmed by His Majesty, the marriage of ———, a pagan, with ———, a Mussulman, is pronounced valid, provided that the latter receives Baptism—We humbly beg Your Majesty to assure the salvation of the United Greeks by allowing them to join the Orthodox Church of All the Russias." It is not surprising that Voltaire, after feasting on such fulsomeness as exhales from these and similar phrases, should write to his "saint," the Messalina of St. Petersburg: "As for me, Madame, I am faithful to the Greek Church (Voltaire was very weak in historical knowledge), and so much the more since in a certain sense your beautiful hands swing its thurible, and since you may be regarded as the Patriarch of All the Russias."[17] Nor can we wonder that among the many millions of Russian dissidents who to-day despise the authority of the official Church, who await an opportunity to combat it *à l'outrance*, and who hate the Catholic Church with a venom almost equal to that expressed by the Holy Synod, by far the greater number find the sole justification of their revolt in the really unchristian dependence of "Orthodoxy" on an earthly power. "For a long time," remarks Gagarin, "the bosom of the Russian Church has been lacerated by dissident sects, but the development of these to-day is immense; between fifteen and eighteen millions are enrolled under their standard."[18] The "Orthodox" author of "The Raskol" says that the Raskolniks "confound the temporal sovereign with the head of the Church (and why not?), and therefore they are in a state of perpetual, although latent, war with the laws of the land. They excommunicate the Czar; they style him Antichrist."[19]

much a hereditary caste as it is in Hindustan; but with this difference, observes Lescœur, that in the latter country the priesthood is honored, whereas in the former to be called a son of a pope is to receive a mortal affront. See Gagarin's "Clergé Russe," p. 20.
[17] Letter of July 6, 1771. [18] "Études d'Histoire et de Theologie," Vol. III., p. 483. [19] Some

Now for a few reflections concerning the Holy Synod, the presumed authoritative voice of Russian "Orthodoxy;" we shall see that the very existence of this tribunal is both an inconsistency and a heterodoxy. We have noted that the author of "Orthodoxy and Popery" reproves the Roman See for an alleged "insatiable yearning for religious innovations;" and it is notorious that the "Orthodox" have always prided themselves on the immobility of their Church, even when they were obliged to ignore the fact that with them immutability and lethargy are generally synonymous. But can the "Orthodox" show us, we will not say any Scriptural foundation, but rather any Eastern tradition—any Eastern conciliar or patristic warrant for the existence of this Holy Synod? Is it not a matter of cold history that this body is much less than two centuries old? And can any student deny that from its very creation it has been the docile instrument of innovations at once anti-canonical and scandalous? Has the Roman Pontiff, whose alleged "omnipotence" is denounced as strenuously by the "Orthodox" as by the Anglicans and other Protestant sectarians, ever attempted to change the essential form of ecclesiastical government; has he ever dared to suppress anything in this line that the Apostles prescribed; has he ever presumed to substitute a cardinalitial, episcopal, presbyteral, or civil governmental régime for that monarchical primacy of Peter alone which all his predecessors declared to be of divine institution? But this most fundamental of all innovations the Russian Czarate effected, without any efficacious or even serious protest on the part of the "Orthodox" hierarchy, when it instituted the Holy Synod. In the "Particular Catechism" of the Russian Church the sublimity of impudence is reached when, on page 68, to the question as to "what ecclesiastical authority rules the principal divisions of the Universal Church," the following answer is given: "The orthodox patriarchs of the East and the Synod of Russia, the order of hierarchical precedence being, 1st, Constantinople; 2nd, Alexandria; 3rd, Antioch; 4th, Jerusalem; 5th, the Patriarchate or Synod of Russia." And then to the question as to the rank of the Holy Synod, the reply is: "The Synod has the rank of a patriarch, since it takes the place of the Patriarchate of Russia which was abolished with the consent of the other patriarchs." The more than implication that there is no such thing as the Patriarchate of Rome; that the Church of God is peculiarly an Oriental Church; was probably very acceptable to the simple "Orthodox" who received as Gospel truth the lessons in history which Nicholas I. gave to his subjects when he decreed that in all the educational institutions of his empire

very interesting studies on the Raskolniks were published in 1874 by Leroy Beaulieu in the *Revue des Deux Mondes.*

the qualification of "tyrant" should never be given to Nero, Caligula, or Ivan the Terrible; that no teacher should dare inform his pupils that the House of Romanoff became extinct in 1761 in the person of the Empress Elizabeth, and that it was the foreign family of Holstein-Gottorp which then (as now) held the czarate; that every pedagogue should insist that the reigning autocrat descended in direct line from Rurick of Moscow; and that the reason for the preference of the ancient Romans for a republic is to be found in the fact that *they had not the good fortune of being acquainted with the blessings which are entailed by the rule of an autocrat.*"[20] As for the implied falsehood that the consent of the Oriental patriarchs to the establishment of the Holy Synod was both seriously asked and freely accorded, we reply that granted this seriousness and this freedom, the prelates in question had no power to change the patriarchal constitution of their churches; and, furthermore, that there is good reason to believe that at least the patriarchate of Constantinople afterward withdrew its consent. This we are led to believe from the words of the well-informed Greek archimandrite, Snagoano, who added to the already cited anathema against "Orthodoxy" the following indictment: "Since the impieties of this Synod are so signal, who will dare to assert that the Russian Church is not schismatical? It is rejected by the Councils; the Canons forbid its recognition; the Church spurns it, and all who hold the faith of the Church, and whom the Church acknowledges as her children, must respect her decisions and regard the Russian Rite as schismatical." However, even if we hold that the Oriental patriarchs could and did abolish the Russian patriarchate, we cannot forget that the constitution of the Holy Synod destroyed the episcopal authority, a thing of divine institution, as to its very essence; that it left the Russian bishops that episcopal character which is God-given, and which no Synod could efface, but that it left them no more authority than that exercised by the unconsecrated Methodists, Episcopalians, Moravians and such like, who merely parade an empty episcopal title. But what would the Greek Fathers have thought of this assembly composed of nominees of an emperor, men who were movable at his caprice?[21] Listen, for instance, to that St. John Damascene whom the "Orthodox" are so fond of quoting in fancied support of their theory concerning the Procession: "The emperors have no right to give laws to the Church. Hearken to the words of the Apostle: The Lord has established Apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers. He says nothing about emperors."[22] And what would St. Athanasius say? "If

[20] "La Vérité sur la Russie," par le Prince Pierre Dolgoroukow, p. 317. Paris, 1860. [21] Only three bishops sit in the Synod *ex officio*—those of Moscow, Kiev and St. Petersburg, and of course these can be removed from their sees at the imperial pleasure. [22] "De

the bishops so decree, why do you speak of the emperor? When did an episcopal decree derive any authority from an emperor; when was such a decree regarded as an imperial decree? Long before our day many synods have been assembled and many decrees have beeen published by the Church; but the Fathers never consulted the emperors, the emperors never examined into ecclesiastical matters. St. Paul had friends among the familiars of Cæsar; but he never admitted them into his councils."[23] Bishops of the calibre of Sts. John Damascene and Athanasius would scarcely have submitted the results of their deliberations to the judgment of a colonel of hussars, himself the creature of a temporal ruler. But this temporal ruler must fain talk in pontifical fashion when he institutes his new secretariate. In 1720, announcing to his subjects the great blessing about to accrue to them, Peter the "Great" thus perorated: "Amid the innumerable cares which are entailed upon us by the supreme power which has been given to us by God, we have cast our regards on ecclesiastical affairs in order to reform our people and the kingdoms subject to our empire; and we have discovered grave disorders, as well as many faults of administration. This fact filled our conscience with legitimate fear lest we would prove ungrateful to the Most High, if, after having effected, through His aid, such happy reforms in the military and civil orders, we neglected (mark the logical sequence of ideas) to exert ourselves to the utmost in order to restore sacred affairs to their highest perfection and their greatest glory. Therefore, following the example of those monarchs of both the Old and the New Testament whose piety was so illustrious,[24] we have determined to improve the present condition of sacred things." And observe the eloquent significance of the oath which each member of the Holy Synod takes on his installation: "I avow and affirm under oath that the supreme judge of this Synod is our monarch, the Most Clement (listen, spirits of Polish martyrs!) Emperor of All the Russias."[25] It is a remarkable fact, observes Tondini, that this avowal of dependence on the Czar—a dependence so utterly incom-

Imaginibus," Art. II., No. 12; cited by Pope Gregory XVI. in his Brief to Mgr. Lewicki, Archbishop of Leopolis, Ruthenian Rite, July 17, 1841. [23] "Hist. Arian. ad Monachos," No. 52. [24] What one of these pious monarchs had three "wives" at the same time? Peter had discarded Eudoxia Lapoukine as well as her successor, and was at this time, while both of these women were still living, "married" to Catharine (afterward Empress as Catharine I.), the wife of a Swedish soldier who had been made prisoner of war. Catharine had been the mistress of two Russian nobles before Peter "married" her. [25] The journals of Russia seem to consider the enslavement of both the Holy Synod and its subjects as a matter of course. On February 2, 1860, just after the death of Colonel Protasoff, the late procurator of the Synod, the *Nord* of St. Petersburg said: "He was in reality, if not in name, the head of the Orthodox Church in Russia. With his firm and energetic will he knew how to conquer the retrograde tendencies of the older clergy. By means of the Synod of which he was the veritable head, he distributed mitres among young and *civilized* ecclesiastics," etc., etc. In a previous number of the QUARTERLY we have shown how Dimitri Tolstoy, although a mere civilian, was a fit successor of this colonel in the matter of *civilizing* the Russian clergy.

patible with the Gospel and so repugnant to the honest student of ecclesiastical history—is not demanded from the members of other Russian tribunals. "The framer of the oath knew what he wanted," says Tondini; "he wanted docile prelates, and he gained his point, thus proving, as he himself boasted, that he was greater than Louis XIV."

Before we treat of the prime inconsistency of Russian "Orthodoxy," its rejection of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, it may be well to notice another inconsistency which it manifests in regard to the instigator of the Greek Schism. Prince Augustine Galitzin, in his valuable work on the "Orthodox" Church,[26] remarks that "the origin of the Schism was so disgraceful that it dares not venerate its founder, whereas, among its thousand other contradictions, it joins the Universal Church on October 23 in celebrating the Feast of St. Ignatius (patriarch of Constantinople), the first victim of Photius."[27] It is true that individual writers of the Russian Church and of the Schismatic Constantinopolitan Patriarchate have been sufficiently audacious to describe Photius as of "happy memory;" and some have ventured to quote his letters to Pope Nicholas I. as models of piety, brazenly ignoring his deposition of his legitimate patriarch and his violent occupation of the patriarchal throne after a reception of Orders *per saltum*—of all, from tonsure to the episcopacy, in the space of six days. Sincerity could not have been characteristic of a prelate who, when prepared to forswear his allegiance to the Holy See, nevertheless wrote to the Pontiff in the following strain, so long as he conceived it possible that Rome might countenance sacrilege and ecclesiastical intrusion: "My predecessor having *resigned* his dignity, the assembled metropolitans, the clergy and, above all, the emperor, who is so kind to others but so cruel to me, impelled by I know not what idea, turned to me, and paying no attention to my prayers, insisted that I should assume the episcopate; in fact, in spite of the tears of my despair, they seized me and executed their will upon me."

As is well observed by Lescœur, if the "Orthodox" theologians have frequently fluctuated between the Church and Protestantism, according to the spirit of the times, and especially according as the imperial will has inclined for the nonce, there is one doctrine concerning which they are frankly Protestant. "When one hears the theologians of the Holy Synod declaiming against Popery, he might believe himself in London or in Geneva; but when he beholds the

[26] "L'Église Greco-Russe." Paris, 1851. This Galitzin should not be confounded with another Galitzin, also a convert, and the author of "La Russie, Est Elle Schismatique?" Paris, 1859. The name of the latter was Nicholas Borrissowitch. [27] For a concise but detailed account of the beginnings of the Greek Schism, and therefore of the sufferings of Ignatius, see our "Studies in Church History," Vol. II.

measures, sometimes petty and often barbarous, with which all recourse to Rome is either prevented or punished, he recognizes that he is in Russia. The Poles know full well that it is more dangerous to be a Papist frankly in Warsaw than it is to be a Raskolnik in Moscow." And nevertheless—and here we approach the chief, the most radical inconsistency, and the *raison d'être* of every heresy which afflicts "Orthodoxy"—a Russian cannot consult the Liturgy of his own Church, or celebrate the feasts which that Liturgy prescribes, or peruse the most authoritative books of devotion recommended by his spiritual advisers, without being confronted in bold relief, as it were, by St. Peter proclaiming his prerogatives, and by the entire body of doctrine which the Roman See teaches to the world. The cultivated Russian cannot escape the knowledge that the Church of Constantinople, from which, as he believes, his ancestors received Christianity, was at that time subject to the See of Rome, or was, as moderns are fond of saying, Roman Catholic. He knows that originally his "Orthodox" Church was far more Roman than Greek; that his Church was not Schismatic Greek in its origin, and that it is not Greek in its language, its polity, or its government. History tells him that his ancestors were converted by the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church; for whether, as we learn from Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the first missionaries to Russia were sent by the Catholic patriarch of Constantinople, Ignatius, in 867, or, as Nestor asserts, by the schismatic intruder, Photius, in 866, it is certain that no real impression was made upon the Russian masses before the close of the tenth century,[28] when the Grand Duke Vladimar, called "the Apostolic," embraced Christianity—an epoch at which the Greeks were in communion with Rome, for the properly so-called Photian Schism had ended with the second and final deposition of the intruder in 889, and the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate remained subject thenceforward to the Holy See until the definitive actuation of the Greek Schism by Cerularius in 1054. Our cultivated Russian knows also that the definitive defection of the Greeks did not much affect the relations of his countrymen with the Papacy until the twelfth century; that only then they were seduced entirely from the Roman obedience; that a reaction having taken place, by the time that the Council of Florence was held (1439) there were as many Catholics as Schismatics in Russia;[29] and that it was a second Photius, Archbishop of Kiev, who extended the Schism throughout the land about the middle of the fifteenth century.[30] Nor will our

[28] About the year 945 Olga or Elga, widow of a grand duke of Russia, journeyed to Constantinople, and was there baptized. Returning to Russia, she tried in vain to convert her countrymen. But her grandson, Vladimir, having married Anna, a sister of the Greek Emperor, Basil II., was baptized in 968, and in a few years nearly all the Russians received the faith. [29] See the Bollandists, at Month of September, No. 41. [30] Some authors hold that

well-informed Russian fail to realize that his Church is not Greek in its liturgical language; that this language is the Slavonic, and not the vernacular, but the Old Slavonic, with which the people are not familiar.[31] Again, this unbiased Russian will learn from the monuments of his own "Orthodox" Church that the Papal supremacy over the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate or, as it was at that time not improperly termed, the Greek Church, dates from the first day of that patriarchate's existence. He must feel that if obedience to the See of Peter had not been part of the faith of all the Oriental Patriarchates when Photius started the Greek Schism on its first stage, that desperate intruder would not have troubled himself so exceedingly to obtain the Pontifical confirmation of his sacrilegious and all but murderous seizure of the Constantinopolitan crozier. Quite naturally he must reason in the same manner when he thinks of Cerularius, who separated definitively the greater number of the Eastern Christians from the communion of Rome. He must ask himself how it is, in the supposition that his own "Orthodox" Church was not Roman in its origin, that his Church celebrates so many feasts which Rome prescribes, but which the Schismatic Greeks reject? And finally he must wonder how it happens that if the Russian Church did not in its early days proclaim the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, nevertheless the ancient "Orthodox" Liturgy avows that supremacy in terms which admit of no exception on the part of a Catholic theologian. For instance, St. Peter is termed "the sovereign pastor of all the Apostles—*pastyr vladytchnyi vsich Apostolov.*" Pope St. Sylvester is called "the divine head of the holy bishops."[32] We read of Pope St. Celestine I. that "firm in his speech and in his works, and following in the traces of the Apostles, he showed himself worthy of occupying the Holy Chair by the decree with which he deposed the impious Nestorius (patriarch of Contantinople)." It is said of Pope

the Schism of Cerularius did not affcet the entire Greek Empire in the eleventh century. It is certain that Pope Alexander II. had an agent, an *apocrisiarius* (not a legate) at the court of the Emperor, Michael Ducas, in the person of Peter, Bishop of Anagni: and it is equally certain that this reprcsentative of the Papacy remained as such in Constantinople for a year. Pope Pascal II. sent Chrysolanus as legate to Alexis Comnenus. It is to be noted that Euthymius Zagabenus, who obeyed the order of Alexis Comnenus to collect all patristic testimonies against each and every heresy, never speaks of the Latins as heretics. Even in the twelfth century there were many Greeks in the communion of Rome, as we learn from many narratives of the Crusades, from the "Alexias" of Anna Comnena, from the "Life of Mannuel," by Nicetas Choniates, and from the letters of the Venerable Peter of Cluny to the Emperor, John Comnenus, and to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

[31] Protestants should note this fact as evidence of their mistake when they adduce the example of the Russian Church as an encouragement for their own use of the vernacular in their Liturgy—when they have one. Not one of the ancient Churches, neither the Greeks, nor the Syrians, nor the Copts, nor the Chaldeans, nor the Armenians, nor the Nestorians, nor the Jacobites have the vernacular of the people for the medium of their Liturgy. The reason is evident; they all have preserved the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and they realize the necessity of having an unchangeable medium for the expression of their sentiments and doctrines—a medium which is furnished by the now unspoken languages in which their ancestors learned the truths of Christianity. For information on this point consult Assemani's "Bibliotheca Orientalis," Vol. IV., ch. 7, 22. Rome, 1719. [32] Gagarin cites the

St. Agapetus that "he deposed the heretical Anthimius (another patriarch of Constantinople), anathematized him, and consecrating Mennas, whose doctrine was irreproachable, placed him in the See of Constantinople." Similarly we hear of Pope St. Martin I. that he "adorned the divine throne of Peter, and holding the Church upright on this rock which cannot be shaken, he honored his name;" and this praise is given to St. Martin because "he segregated Cyrus (patriarch of Alexandria), Sergius (another patriarch of Constantinople), Pyrrhus and all their adherents from the Church." Pope St. Leo I. is styled "the successor of St. Peter on the highest throne, the heir of the impregnable rock." Pope St. Leo III. is thus addressed: "Chief pastor of the Church, fill the place of Jesus Christ." What must be the feelings of any sacerdotally sensitive member of the enslaved "Orthodox" clergy, when he hears his Liturgy teaching how a Pope ought to speak to a wicked or heretical sovereign! We hear Pope Gregory II. warning Leo the Isaurian, the imperial champion of the Iconoclasts: "Endowed as we are with the power and sovereignty of St. Peter, we have determined to prohibit you," etc. Nor does this same Liturgy of the Russian Church hesitate to admit that a Roman Pontiff can excommunicate emperors as well as patriarchs; and not only emperors who belong to the Roman Patriarchate, but also those of the Eastern. In a fragment of a Life of St. John Chrysostom this Liturgy tells its admirers that "Pope Innocent wrote more than once to Arcadius, separating him and his wife, Eudoxia, from the communion of the Church, and pronouncing anathema on all who had helped in driving St. John Chrysostom from his See. He not only deprived Theophilus (patriarch of Alexandria), but he segregated him from the Church. Then Arcadius wrote to Pope Innocent, begging pardon most humbly, and assuring the Pope of his repentance. The emperor wrote also to his brother Honorius, asking him to implore the Pontiff to lift the excommunication, and he obtained the favor." It certainly appears strange that during so many centuries the leaders of the "Orthodox" Russian Church have not found some means of disembarrassing themselves of these and many similar testimonies of their own Liturgy to the supremacy of the Chair of Peter; but at least they have endeavored to neutralize the force of these arguments by a free use of that favorite weapon of all heretics—calumny. Prince Nicholas Galitzin, writing while he was still an "Orthodox" professor, averred that "in Russian seminaries it is taught that in the eyes of Catholics the Pope is an irresponsible autocrat, claiming to be *impeccable*."[33] And that

quotations which we give, and many similar ones, in the Old Slavonic text, in his "Études de Theologie," Vol. II.; and Tondini comments on them most judiciously in his "La Primauté de Saint Pierre Prouvée par les Titres que Lui Donne L'Église Russe dans Sa Liturgie." Paris, 1867. [33] "La Russie, Est-Elle Schismatique?" p. 38.

medical theologian, Karatheodori, whose work, by the way, was translated into French by a Russian priest formally commissioned to the task by the Russian government, dared to emit the following: "Popery asks us to recognize in this mortal (the Pope) all the rights and all the authority of the Universal Church . . . and what is more, it asks us to believe that by ordinance of God this mortal is superior to all the Divine Commandments themselves, and that he enjoys the right to change them, adding to them or subtracting from them according to his own will." Having read this barefaced illustration of "Orthodox" mendacity, we are prepared for the Greek physician's assertion that men of the stamp of "the Jesuit Prince" (Gagarin, whose writings Karatheodori affected to refute) are "ever ready to reject the clearest truths," and that they prosecute their ends by means of lies and the falsification of documents, following the example of the "Council of Florence, in which Cardinal Julian (Cesarini) adduced forged Acts of the Seventh General Council." Here the Sultan's physician simply imitated the time-serving Mark of Ephesus in his too successful efforts to undo the good work of the Florentine synodals, carefully refraining, however, from any mention of the refutation of the Ephesine prelate's charges which Bessarion, the most eminent Greek Schismatic of any day, and who was converted by his experience at this same Council of Florence, adduced in his apposite letter to Alexis Lascaris. The reader will scarcely accuse us of digression, if we dilate somewhat on this charge against the Florentine synodals, since the words of Bessarion illustrate the position assumed by Karatheodori and others of that ilk. Mark of Ephesus had accused the Latins of having adduced falsified testimonies of the Fathers as corroboratory of the Catholic doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and to this calumny Bessarion, who was still the Schismatic Archbishop of Nicea, thus replied: "Finally they (the Latins) showed us testimonies of the Fathers which evinced most clearly the truth of their teaching; and they adduced passages not only of Western Fathers, against which we could only contend that they had been corrupted by the Latins, but also sayings of our Epiphanius which declared plainly that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, and to this evidence we also retorted that it had been corrupted. Then they introduced Cyprian and others, and we gave the same answer; finally we repeated this reply when they adduced the authority of Western saints. And when we (the Schismatics) had debated among ourselves for many days as to what we ought to say, we could devise no other reply, even though it seemed too trivial for our purpose. And firstly, the doctrine (of the Roman Church) appeared to be concordant with the mind of the saints; secondly, so many and so an-

cient were the volumes containing it, that they could not have been falsified easily, and we could show neither Latin nor Greek copies which gave the quoted passages differently from the version of the Latins; and thirdly, we were unable to cite any doctors who contradicted the Roman doctrine. Therefore it was that being unable to find an apposite reply, we remained silent for many days, holding no sessions with the Latins."[34]

So much for the "Orthodox" allegation of dishonesty on the part of that Œcumenical Council which put a temporary end to the Greek Schism. Such charges form the stock in trade for such of the "Orthodox" clergy as enjoy some smattering of theological education; but unfortunately for the prospects of conversion of the majority of the teachers of "Orthodoxy," the average Protestant preacher in these United States is scarcely less versed in the essential elements of ecclesiastical lore. Were the "Orthodox" clergy well indoctrinated even with profane science, of course not with the German materialism which alone has affected some of them, they would come to realize the truth of those words which Lamoricière addressed to the Pontifical army on the eve of the unsuccessful but glorious campaign of Castelfidardo: "Christianity is not only the religion of the civilized world. It is the moving principle and the very life of civilization, and the Papacy is the key-stone in the arch of Christianity. To-day all Christian nations seem to have some consciousness of these truths." Gagarin would discern Russia among the nations whose perspicacity appealed to Lamoricière. "Russia does not yet believe," reflected the zealous ex-Orthodox polemic, "that the Papacy is the key-stone of Christianity; she does not comprehend the phrase, but already she seems to have a sort of consciousness of its truth, and in her pale there is an increasing number of souls who are penetrated by that truth, and who place their chief hopes in it."[35]

Reuben Parsons.

Yonkers, N. Y.

[34] But Bessarion was not satisfied with repelling the Schismatical charge that the Roman theologians were falsifiers; he retorted the charge against the Greeks. Speaking of a passage from St. Basil in which that Father says that "the Holy Ghost is from the Son, having His being from Him, receiving from Him, and depending entirely from that Cause," the Archbishop of Nicea declared that out of six codices of St. Basil's works brought by his fellow-schismatics to Florence, five gave the passage in question in its entirety, while the sixth codex "was defective in some parts, and presented many additions which had been made according to the whims of the transcriber." When he returned to Constantinople, the Archbishop searched the libraries, and he discovered indeed some codices in which the questioned passage was absent; but those codices were perfectly new, having evidently been written after the termination of the Council of Florence. At the same time the prelate found in the libraries many ancient manuscripts of St. Basil's works in which the passage occurred. [35] "Tendances Catholiques dans La Société Russe," Paris, 1860.

THE TWO KENRICKS: THEIR EARLY ENVIRONMENT.

REGARD for the interests of the Church, the requirements of historical justice, and the characters of the two distinguished brothers, the Archbishops Kenrick, necessitates the task of preparing a record of their lives, in the world and in the Church, which may fill up and complete such sketches of each as have already been given to the world. It is true that each of these distinguished men filled so large a space on the Church's canvas, in his own time, that no biographer could possibly hope to present a complete reflection of their lives, their views, and their acts in the compass of anything less than an encyclopædia. But so many details have been left untouched by former writers, so many lacunæ remain to be filled in, and so many lights require to be thrown upon the picture, that the attempt at a complete biography ought no longer to be postponed, lest the importance of so doing should become obscured by the demands of an ever-widening ecclesiastical growth. Such a work is now in preparation; and as a note of introduction to it some word of the early surroundings of the Kenrick family and the social, political and literary atmosphere which prevailed when they began to imbibe their ideas may not be without interest.

It was in the old portion of the Irish capital, known for centuries of warfare as "the Pale," that the Kenrick family had their habitation. This was in earlier times the part of the city which was enclosed within embattled walls, with fortified gateways and loopholed towers, designed to repel the "wild Irishrie," camped often enough on the opposite bank of the Liffey, in threatening design and formidable force. Circumscribed by the military cincture, the citizens were obliged to restrain their taste for wide streets, if they had any, and so all around the central fortress, known as "the Castle," there spread a network of narrow, crooked and dingy thoroughfares, many of which might be easily spanned by a man's extended arms, some by much less. It was in one of these, which was called Chancery lane, that the family of the Kenricks had their abode. The thoroughfare, which a few years ago was condemned to demolition for street improvement, ran from Bride street to Golden lane, and was in early times quite an aristocratic part of the city. Here, indeed, was kept the Court of Chancery, from which it derived its title, and here lived in great state some of the high officials connected with that important department of the State, as well as some of the great legal lights of succeeding eras. The Chancery Court was in the evolution of the city transferred to the central building

across the river, known as the Four Courts—the first stately pile which compels the admiration of all travelers driving along the Dublin quays from the western side. Not one in a thousand explorers in old Dublin could realize, from the present condition of such ancient thoroughfares, it is safe to say, what was their estate in the more prosperous period before the Act of Union despoiled Ireland of her Parliament and Dublin of her resident notables. No one could ever dream that such forlorn and dilapidated and foul-smelling places as Chancery lane was one of the most fashionable thoroughfares in the city, or that crowds of beaux in court suits and powdered periwigs, and dainty ladies *à la* Watteau as to attire, borne in sedan chairs, might be found there, on the way to Christ Church or St. Patrick's on Sundays, or mayhap to the Fishamble street or Smock alley theatre, close by, on week nights, with the link-boys running before them to light the way. Yet such indeed was the position of the whole interesting neighborhood. Across the street lay—and still lies—a little pocket of old rookeries called Derby Square, the entrance to which is a passage little more than a yard in width yet in its time this was the abode of a number of the Irish nobility and a place of the most exclusive *haut ton.* Crossing the thoroughfare called Skinners' alley, just outside the opening of Bride street (which was originally "St. Bride's"), one came to an archway which spanned an arcade running alongside the southern wall of Christ Church Cathedral. Above this archway stood a carved wooden effigy of Satan, and the arcade itself, as if in cynical mockery of its proximity to a consecrated edifice, bore the awesome name of "Hell." The arcade itself was a warren of lawyers' offices: perhaps this circumstance may be explanatory, to some extent, of the strange title, for in Ireland there is some traditional connection between the gentleman in black and the black-robed gentlemen who plead in the law courts—a connection which they themselves, in that age, did not repudiate, since we know from O'Connell's biographies that the corps of volunteers formed from the members of the Bar, and of which he for some time was one, was known as "the Devil's Own." The presence of these lawyers' offices in the sulphurously-named arcade was explained by the fact that in a sort of annex of Christ Church Cathedral was held the Court of Exchequer, which was also originally located near Chancery lane, in another dingy thoroughfare called Exchequer street. Interspersed with the lawyers' dens were several of the more congenial resorts known at the time as chop houses, some famous coffee houses and some equally celebrated taverns. Night-time at all these establishments found them crowded with the wits of the Irish Bar and the idle class of Dublin—men of the stamp of John Philpot Curran, Ned Lysaght

and Jonah Barrington; and mirth and repartee prolonged far into the small hours gave a colorable base for a theory of "happiness in Hell." Only separated by the width of St. Werburgh's Church—where the Irish Viceregal Court worships when not residing in "the Castle," but at the Viceregal Lodge in the Phœnix Park—from Chancery lane ran Hoey's court, another constricted avenue to the Castle region, made immortal by its connection with the great Dean of St. Patrick's. It was in this now squalid and fever-laden purlieu that Jonathan Swift first assumed his "heritage of woe;" and if the house in which he was born is still allowed to lurch and nod there, propped up by internal and external crutches, a menace to the denizens and curiosity-hunters, it is simply a tribute to one who had very little respect himself for things deserving of demolition.

If in the secular sense the ground was classic, in the loftier one it was far more so. It was ground consecrated to the holiest use by the sainted footsteps of Ireland's glorious Apostle, Patrick, by the scarcely less sanctified sandals of St. Laurence O'Toole, and by many a martyred prelate and priest of the sanguinary days of the Tudors. Perhaps the first sounds that broke on the infant ears of the future Archbishops were the peals of the campaniles of the twin Cathedrals of St. Patrick and the Holy Trinity, whose shadows fell athwart the family homestead, from the one at noonday, from the other at eventide. The older pile was originally reared by St. Patrick himself. In its crypt may yet be seen portions of the original structure, while many mementoes of the days when Catholicism was the only faith of the land show in the larger pile which grew up around the foundation that the holy hand of the great Apostle had laid. In the days of Danish supremacy in Dublin the newer mass of the Holy Trinity Cathedral sprang into being, as a memorial of the piety of the Scandinavian monarch, Sitric. The rapacity of the "Reformers" had wrested from Catholic hands both these beautiful "poems in stone." And within a stone's throw of each are similar proofs of the satire of the newer "evangelization." St. Audoen's Church and tower are monuments of the piety of a foreign merchant, it is said, who was shipwrecked on the estuary of the Liffey, and who in gratitude for his rescue devoted a fortune to their erection. So, too, the Church of St. Nicholas Within, in near by Patrick street. The forgotten founder of this edifice left a fund for its maintenance, on condition that a Mass be ever afterward offered for the repose of his soul, once a year, within its walls. The church is now a ruin, but the bequest remains; and on the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland, thirty years ago, it came out that the then incumbent, the Rev. Tresham Gregg, drew his salary of four

hundred pounds per annum from that bequest, although the church had fallen into desuetude, on the plea that he had held a Protestant service of some kind within the ruin once in every year since he had come into enjoyment of the benefice, although prayers for the dead were to clerics of his stamp a Popish superstition. The names of St. Bride and St. Werburgh suggest also the reverence which in the older days of the City of the Pale was felt by the inhabitants of this particular quarter. No Catholic can tread this ground insensible to the sacred memories which make it hallowed. We may be sure that they sank into the souls of the youths who were destined in other lands to revive the glory of the old faith, and fired them with the noble ambition of compensating in some measure for the great wrong by which such beautiful temples of the Most High were wrested from their proper purpose, by rearing, under other skies, many a fane wherein the worship banned by English law might be rendered by hearts still leal to the true Church of Christ.

While the Protestant churches thus flourished in the borrowed splendor of other days all around, in the same ambit the sanctuaries of the Catholics existed only on sufferance. Mole-like they carried on their office in obscure alleys, hidden by the surrounding factories and dwellings of the poor. They were not honored with the title of church. In the Puritan *régime* they were "Mass-houses" (with a small m); when the period of toleration supervened, they were, by a great stretch of liberality, designated "chapels." Catholics themselves, by force of usage, grew into the habit of so referring to them. Thus we find Dr. Clarke, in his short sketch of Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore, stating that his uncle was "parish priest of Francis Street Chapel." The proper description of the edifice is "Church of St. Nicholas of Myra;" and in Catholic days the street on whose line it is situate received its full title of St. Francis street. This curtailment of name of street and square became a universal practice, in Dublin as in most other places where the "reformers" had a strong footing. Bride street was originally "St. Bride's street," Stephen's green "St. Stephen's green," Audoen's Arch "St. Audoen's," Patrick street "St. Patrick's street." The great Abbey of White Friars, said to have been founded in Dublin several centuries before the Anglo-Norman invasion, was represented in those days by a modest church walled in by a mask of high houses on Aungier street in the front and Whitefriars street in the rear; and the principal approach to the edifice to the present day is through a passage cut in these same houses (now tenanted by the Carmelite community themselves) from Aungier street. The Church of St. Michael and John was buried in a wretched little wynd called

Smock alley; so, too, the neighboring Church of St. John the Evangelist, familiarly known in that period and much later as "Adam and Eve Chapel." These examples will serve to show the spirit of the days of relaxed persecution. Not only was the Catholic system held in contempt by the dominant spoilers, but Catholics themselves, insensible to self-respect, accepted the contempt unmurmuringly, content, apparently, that they were accorded the privilege of a despised existence as a separate religious denomination. This was the degeneration which caused the Protestant poet, Thomas Davis, to write:

> "No wonder that his step betrays
> The freedman born in Penal days."

Nor was it merely in material and inanimate things that the brand of moral inferiority was thus sought to be permanently affixed upon the vanquished downtrodden. All public and private life around was redolent of insult and injustice to Catholics. They were debarred from citizen rights, they could not aspire to any public office. They had to endure the galling wrong of taxation without representation. Their vulgar-minded and implacable foes seized every possible opportunity of taunting them on their overthrow and their condition of serfdom. The name of Skinners' alley has been mentioned. It no longer exists, but in those days it was an unsavory narrow thoroughfare which lay where Christ Church place now opens up the view along Thomas street, and its chief claim to notoriety was the house of a fraternity called the "Aldermen of Skinners' Alley." Antedating the Orange Society, the aims and principles of these conspirators were precisely the same as those avowed by the Ulster brotherhood. They held drunken carousals on all Williamite anniversaries, and their headquarters on these occasions were always the focus of riot and noisy demonstrations intended to insult the Catholic population. They drank sulphurous toasts to the downfall of Pope and Popery; they marched in defiant procession, decked with the flaunting emblems of bigotry, on Boyne anniversaries, down to the statue of King William on College green, and, having decked it with festoons of orange lilies and streamers, marched around it like bacchanals, to the clamor of fife and drum. They lorded it in the Municipal Council, and squandered the citizens' money without let or hindrance in these orgies of insult.

Such was the condition of things which the Catholic community in the Irish capital had to endure year after year down to the date of the Emancipation Act; and such on a smaller scale was it in the lesser cities wherever the Ascendency party was numerous enough to indulge in insult and outrage with impunity. In such an atmos-

phere, and right in the storm-centre of perennial persecution, was the abode of the Kenrick family.

A difficult thing, one may well imagine, to cultivate, amid such environments, the holy virtues of piety, charity, self-restraint and love of one's neighbor. Yet this was precisely what the Kenrick family did during many trying years. Only supernatural grace could have enabled them to do it. And this grace, beyond all question, was given to the two youths who were destined to plant the flower, in due time, upon a far-off strange soil.

The fact that the orthography of the family name has seemed doubtful to some who were familiar with it need not surprise any reader, since variorum spellings of patronymics are common, especially under Anglo-Saxon processes of adjustment. The name would appear to be of Danish or Scottish origin, judging from its modern form of presentation; but it is unsafe to be guided by such a rule. If the Kenricks had long been rooted in Dublin, it is highly probable that they sprang from a Danish stock, since the Northmen had obtained a firm foothold in the Irish capital and held it steadfastly for several centuries, even after their power was broken at Clontarf. They became highly civilized, and developed not only talents for commerce, but for the liberal arts, as may still be seen by the noble structure of Christ Church Cathedral, as well as by many interesting relics of their *régime* preserved in the Royal Irish Academy. A large number of notable Dublin families trace their origin to this period, and if that of the Kenricks were of the same stock the fact would, so far from militating against their intellectual claims or their patriotic standing, only strengthen the belief in the benefits of an admixture of the strongest races in the development of the highest physical and spiritual types. A process of mutation has been going on in the spelling of family names ever since the English language was introduced into Ireland and endeavored to accommodate its characters to the different sounds and signs of the Gaelic speech. Still it is hard to conceive how the change from Kendrick, as sometimes spelt, to Kenrick could have taken place, since the *d* is, in such a position as in this case, a forcible factor in the determination of the sound, not to be eliminated by the natural tendency to drop such letters as finals. Kendrick and Kenrick may have been originally entirely distinct family names. Indeed genealogists might find a purely Irish derivation for Kenrick by tracing its connection with the other Irish patronymic MacEnery, by presuming that in course of time the common process of ellipsis had worn away the first two letters of the Mac and left the strong final consonant as the first and determining particle of the parent name. This is notoriously the case with regard to many Irish names, such

as Guinness or Ginnis, evidently an abbreviation of MacInnis or Innes, Keever from MacIvor or Eever, and so on. There is in existence a couple of convincing proofs that even those connected closely with this particular Kenrick family believed that the proper orthography of the name included the *d;* and this fact starts the query whether any members or branches of it had conformed to the State religion in the penal days, for certain it is that at least one Kendrick is found in that unfortunate position. This individual, moreover, was one who had acquired a certain share of reflected fame by his connection with immortal genius, and lives in biography, although in most cases anonymously. It is known that during the earlier part of the eighteenth century one Roger Kendrick was City Surveyor to the city of Dublin, and afterwards Verger of St. Patrick's Cathedral. He acted in the latter capacity to the famous Dr. Jonathan Swift. When the Dean on a certain occasion had prepared to address a congregation, he only found the official Verger present. However, in no manner disconcerted, the witty Dean commenced his sermon with the words, "My dearly beloved Roger," and the discourse was rendered brief as the circumstances very properly required.

This Roger Kendrick, however, appears to have had talents beyond the needs of a verger—in fact, had claims to a literary distinction of his own. Some years ago there lived in Werburgh street, in Dublin, a curious antiquarian—one who combined archæology with commerce in a very prosaic way—Mr. Edward Evans. Like the Scottish devotee, he might describe himself as cultivating the Muses on oatmeal, since while his shelves upstairs were loaded with the rarest literary treasures he dispensed meal and flour from behind his counter to customers with the unaffected bonhomie of the genuine philosopher. When Mr. Evans died his precious collection was put under the auctioneer's hammer, and amongst the rare volumes disposed of was a collection of Sir James Ware's works (Walter Harris' edition). In the catalogue of these was found the following note:

"The first volume ('History of the Bishops,' etc.) belonged to a subscriber, Roger Kendrick, City Surveyor to the Corporation of Dublin, and afterwards Verger of St. Patrick's Cathedral; it contains his autograph and numerous interesting MS. marginal notes by him; several of the subscribers are noted as being his friends; after Dean Swift's name is written: 'Under God, my best friend.' It afterwards passed into the possession of the Ven. Archdeacon Cotton (has his autograph), who made corrections in the addenda, and it subsequently became the property of the present owner, who, with great labour and research, compiled, as a supplement, in clearly

written MS., The Succession of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland from the Reformation to the present time, with the Ecclesiastical Division of the Dioceses, Biographical Memoirs and Notices of the most distinguished Ecclesiastics, and an Index, thus rendering it a Unique Copy of the Work, and an invaluable contribution to the Ecclesiastical History of Ireland."

The man who could claim Swift as "his best friend under God" enjoyed a rare distinction, and if he were a real Kenrick it is to be regretted that such an intellect was to be found on the side of those who made the laws to oppress the more steadfast Kenricks and men of like genius and fidelity, and scattered them all over the globe.

Thomas Kenrick, the father of the two famous prelates, lived in No. 16 Chancery lane; later on he kept a scrivener's office in York street, a thoroughfare running eastward from Aungier street to St. Stephen's green. It was at that day an exceedingly select section, and, indeed, it has not very much deteriorated since. The business of scrivener was an important and respectable one; for all legal documents were then required to be copied by hand, to be rigidly correct in the minutest particular, following set legal formulæ, and abounding in quaint Latin and Norman-French phrases and abbreviations. In this office the two youths successively spent several years before entering on their clerical studies; and it was here that the wonderfully gifted, "most musical, most melancholy" Irish poet, James Clarence Mangan, spent an apprenticeship which he seemed to regard as a kind of Promethean fetterment. This may be gathered at least from an article of his on the life of Dr. Petrie, the renowned archæologist, in whose company he afterwards spent several years in the Record Office of Dublin. A true poet is a sort of unconsecrated priest—though in his material life he may be the very antithesis of one, as the world knows too well. Mangan seems to have had all the refinement of the spiritual nature; but he possessed, unfortunately for himself, that species of fatalistic melancholy against which the sacred calling is, in sensitive and high-strung natures, the only true shield and antidote. His sublime gloom—worse by many degrees than that of Byron—was intensified by poverty. He was compelled to drudge at the scrivener's desk for the support of a helpless family; and to make his servitude all the more poignant, he had betaken himself to the deadly solace of drink—some say opium besides. The poet's plaint of this period when he felt, like Samson, "in brazen fetters doomed to grind," is heartrending; yet it compels the tribute of sympathy and admiration, for in its deepest agony his spirit confessed the hand of the Divinity and acknowledged his own lament-

able weakness, as in the opening note of that cry of anguish, unmatched since the psalter of Job, "The Nameless One"—

> "Roll forth, my song, like a mighty river
> That rushes along to the boundless sea:
> God will uphold me while I deliver
> My soul of thee."

Under all his trials and mental submersions Mangan carried the rectitude of the Catholic heart. To his exemplary conduct in the scrivener's office the late Archbishop of St. Louis, who had spent some years there along with him, bore unqualified testimony in a letter to Mr. John McCall, of Dublin, in October, 1877. His Grace said:

"I knew James Mangan for several years very intimately, and highly esteemed him for his talents and virtue. . . . After my father's death, in 1817, his office was continued for some years, in which both Mangan and myself were engaged. The office was in York street."

It was Father Francis Kenrick who continued the office for those years. He conducted it for the benefit of the widow and children of his brother. We may be sure that this holy priest would have no one in his employment who was unworthy of confidence and respect. Great, then, must be the admiration felt for the gifted poet's character when he is found bearing up manfully with a condition which was repugnant wholly with his aspirations, for the sake of those who were cast helplessly on his hands. He was at this time a lad in his teens, and the power of poetical expression which even at that early age was his is indicated in those lines which he afterwards recalled when penning his article on his departed friend, Dr. Petrie:

> "O Genius! Genius! all thou dost endure
> First from thyself, and finally from those
> The earth-bound and the blind, who cannot feel
> That there be souls with purposes as pure
> And lofty as the mountain snows, and zeal
> All quenchless as the spirit whence it flows,
> In whom that fire, struck like the spark from steel,
> In other bosoms ever lives and glows.
> Of such, thrice blest are they whom, ere mature
> Life generate woes which God alone can heal,
> His mercy calls to a loftier sphere than this—
> For the mind's conflicts are the worst of woes:
> And fathomless and fearful yawns the Abyss
> Of Darkness thenceforth under all who inherit
> That melancholy changeless hue of heart
> Which flings its pale gloom o'er the years of youth,
> Those most—or least—illumined by the spirit
> Of the eternal archetype of Truth.
> For such as those there is no peace within
> Either in action or in contemplation,
> From first to last—but even as they begin,
> They close the dim night of their tribulation;
> Worn by the torture of the untiring breast,
> Which, scorning all, and shunned of all, by turns,

> Upheld in solitary strength begot
> By its own unshared shroudedness of lot,
> Through years and years of crushed hopes, throbs and burns,
> And burns and throbs, and will not be at rest,
> Searching a desolate Earth for that it findeth not.'

Although the aloës of disappointment permeates this rhadsody, there is none of the misanthropy of the weary sensualist that cast a pall over Byron's melancholy spells, as mirrored in "Manfred." Hence when it is known that the intimacy between the elder Kenrick and Mangan was so close as to permit the one to learn German from the other, there could be no fear that any distrust in God was drunk in with the communion of ideas. Mangan was an enthusiastic student of German literature, and singularly well versed in the language. His "German Anthology" is a living proof of his genius in this regard, and his whole-souled sympathy with the spirit of German poesy.

Father Kenrick, as already stated, carried on his brother's business for the benefit of his widow, whose name was Jane. He did so until the year 1825 (two years before his own demise), and though there is no documentary or other authority for his reasons in resigning it then, we may be sure that the necessity for continuing it had quite ceased, for the business of scrivener was at that period, and for many years after, both profitable and reputable. Hence those who read the life of James Clarence Mangan will find it necessary to fortify themselves against the wayward and lymphatic poet's morbidness over this period of his career, lest they be led into doing a grave injustice to the memory of an exemplary and most conscientious priest. One would really think, from Mangan's tone, that he was little more than such a drudge as Dickens painted in drawing the character of Smike, toiling unconscionable hours in a dingy den for the most jejune pittance. He left a blood-curdling account of the moral tortures he underwent while earning his bread as a scrivener's apprentice and afterwards as an attorney's hack, but these are declared unreliable. The late Father Meehan, O. S. F., the eminent historian of "The Franciscans in Ireland," and kindred makers of ecclesiastical history, a personal friend of the poet's, questioned him on the subject, and concluded the story was based on self-deception or morbid fancy.

At the period when the two Kenricks began to receive their first impressions of the meaning of life the atmosphere was redolent of the spirit of heroism and sacrifice. At every Catholic fireside the tale of persecution and chivalric resistance was told with emotion and lingered over with pious delight. The daring of the priests in the crucial times when hunters like the Portuguese Jew, Garcia, made it a regular business to set and capture them by means of ma-

chinery resembling somewhat that of Pinkerton's agency of our own day, was the theme of many a fireside story. The Unitarian historian, John Mitchell, pays a tribute to the steadfast heroism of the priesthood, amid that storm of savagery, which brings it vividly before the mind's eye: "In truth," he says, "the ardent zeal and constancy, utterly unknown to fear, of the Irish Catholic priests during that whole century" (the eighteenth) "are as admirable in the eyes of all just and impartial men as they were abominable and monstrous in the eyes of the Protestant interest. They often had to traverse the sea between Ireland and France in fishing smacks, and disguised as fishermen, carrying communications to or from Rome, required by the laws of their Church, though they knew that on their return, if discovered, the penalty was the penalty of high treason—that is, death. When in Ireland, they had often to lurk in caves and make fatiguing journeys, never sure that the priest-hunters were not on their trail; yet all this they braved with a courage which, in any other cause, would have been reckless desperation. The English colonists could not comprehend such chivalrous devotion at all, and could devise no other theory to account for it than that these priests must be continually plotting with foreign Catholics to overthrow the Protestant interest and plunder them of their newly-gotten estates. This was the secret terror that always urged them to fresh atrocities."

Nor were the Muse's favors limited, in that unlikely old precinct of Dublin, to the eccentric children of genius, Swift and Mangan. Not very far off, in Aungier street, the more fortunate child of song, Thomas Moore, first saw the light a few years before the latter. The house in which Mangan came into the world almost faced Hoey's court, wherein Swift first drew breath. Probably not more than twenty or thirty yards' length separated the two. Moore's birthplace was a few hundred yards away. It was a grocery store, and so was the Mangans' place. But Moore's parents were prosperous, while the other poet's were the reverse. Moore got the best education that Trinity College could give, while his less fortunate but more gifted brother of the lyre was fain to be contented with whatever odd learning he could pick up outside the parish school.

Mangan's patriotism, if we may judge from his writings in the *Nation* and the impassioned spirit of some of his poems, was more sterling and deep-seated than that of the "curled darling" of the Irish aristocracy, Thomas Moore. The lines in which it found expression flowed from the soul of one who had nought to gain by the iambics which attuned an individual melancholy to a nation's threnody of bereavement. But it had no share in the formation of patriotism in the mind of Francis Patrick Kenrick, inasmuch as he never knew

Mangan personally. The times in which his youthful mind found expansion would be likely to infuse in him a spirit of defiance and revolt without any external stimulus. His infant ears may have been pierced with those sounds which filled O'Connell's heart with dread of a further appeal to physical resistance to the powers that were in Ireland. Born within bowshot of the Castle-keep of Dublin, the cries of the men tortured at the triangles in its court-yards must have fallen upon his undiscerning ear, and were he ever taken abroad by parent or nurse, his wondering eyes might have fastened with instinctive shuddering upon tthe phenomenon of a crimson tinge in the street gutters—the sickening token of slaughter in the public ways which impelled the Lord Lieutenant's wife to implore her husband to put a stop to the daily butchery of Irish patriots in Thomas street and the adjoining thoroughfares upon the defeat of the insurgents of '98. He was ten years old when the mad attempt of young Emmet was quenched in blood, and then, surely, he must have received a vivid impression of the meaning of English rule in his native land and the fate of those who dared to oppose it. His youthful ears must have drunk in the thrilling story of that daring enthusiast; he may have heard his voice thundering out its notes of defiance to Norbury in the courthouse across the river; perchance he was one of those who caught a glimpse of his bearing on the scaffold and saw the dogs lap his blood below after the executioner had got through his ghastly work. We cannot tell; yet we are free to surmise that such moving incidents had their effect, either from the actual beholding or the recital, upon the sympathetic spirit of the embryo patriot and churchman, from the intensity of his devotion to the cause of his country in his youthful days and his abhorrence of the cruel system which doomed her brightest and her best to ignominy in quiescence or torture and death if they dared to assert the spirit of freemen. All the environment was redolent of this spirit: futile resistance, imprescriptible oppression, were written upon the very stones of the streets and the fabrics which sprang up around. On the spikes of the Castle gates grinned the skulls of those whom the English called traitors then as in the days of Shane the Proud; the Birmingham Tower, close by, showed from whence the gallant boy-princes, O'Neill and O'Donnell, had sought release from English thraldom at the risk of their lives. Across the street, at Cork-hill, stood the house at which Lord Maguire and the leaders of the revolt of 1641 planned their abortive attack on the stronghold of British power in Ireland; a few hundred yards away, off Thomas street, was the building in which Emmet planned his assault and piled up his munitions of war; close by was the spot, opposite St. Catherine's Church, where he paid with his

life the ransom of his bold attempt; a few yards further and the patriot came upon the house in which the gallant Geraldine, Lord Edward, was trapped by the red-coated hunters and fell like a soldier. The spirit of Swift and Molyneux and Lucas still hovered over the old Council Chamber on the brow of the Castle hill; the burning periods of Grattan thrilled the atmosphere beyond the walls of that legislative fabric soon to become a temple of the money-changers. The mute memorials of a defeated but unsubdued nationality were all around; and the air was vibrant with tokens of its returning life. Back lane, where the sturdy Catholic Committee had voiced its vitality so often, under the leadership of John Keogh, was within a stone's throw of the Kenrick home. The fearless Daniel O'Connell was speaking with a Stentor's voice in denunciation of the immeasurable wrong which at once stifled the religious liberty of his countrymen and their civil freedom.

Gloomy apprehensions had pictured the melancholy results which must follow the Act of Union: a lowering of the moral prestige of the nation must be accompanied with material losses to its arts, its industries and its commerce. More swiftly than had been anticipated these forebodings were borne out by the event. The withdrawal of the nobility and Parliamentary representatives to London had almost instantly brought ruin to many Dublin mercantile firms. That city had long been enriched by the almost constant presence of a rich and prodigal aristocracy, luxurious in its tastes and full of rivalry in display of equipage and retinue. At one blow all the arts and industries of which this proud society was the pillar were stricken down. The great mansions of the nobles, both in town and country, were shut up or devoted to sordid uses, while their owners drained the country of vast sums of money in the shape of rent, to be squandered in London or on the European Continent. Within a few years of the passage of the Union measure a very large proportion of the mercantile houses of the metropolis, which had been in prosperous circumstances while Parliament sat there, had filed petitions in bankruptcy. The public debt of the country had increased in inverse ratio to the falling-off in its resources. While it had stood at only a little over two million pounds before the Union, in four years' time after that event it had mounted up to the enormous total of more than fifty-four millions. Imports of manufactured articles from England began at the same time to drive those of Ireland out of the home market, by reason of their lower price, though inferior quality. Despite this decreasing exchequer, the screw of taxation succeeded in drawing greatly enhanced sums from the pockets of the people, so that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was enabled to make a cynical jest about

the prosperity of the country as indicated by his increased receipts, while in the very same year he was obliged to bring in a bill for the relief of the people whom Pitt's policy had rendered homeless and penniless public burdens. Little wonder that the whole island was seething with discontent when it found itself thus cajoled, deceived and betrayed, or that the Ministry found itself unable to proceed without recurring again and again to the time-worn panacea for every Irish ill, a fresh Coercion Act.

All through these years of multiplying evils the religious difficulty grew more and more in tension and menace to the public peace. Far from finding relief from the United Parliament, as Pitt and Castlereagh had promised, the Irish Catholics found only an intensified persecution. That nefarious institution, the Orange Society, was encouraged openly in its war of aggression upon Ulster Catholics and obstruction of every concession sought for the general body by the liberal-minded few in Parliament. Arms were furnished the lodges from the governmental arsenals; agents of the Government were sent down from Dublin to organize lodges in districts where none had existed, and to excite animosity against the Catholic residents. These things are vouched for by the impartial Protestant historian, Mr. Plowden. When the Catholic Committee organized a movement for redress it was met by the odious device known as the Convention Act, a measure ostensibly directed against revolutionary purposes, but in reality intended to extinguish the constitutional rights of public meeting and free speech—in Ireland only—for no such procedure would be tolerated in any other part of the United Kingdom. This tyrannical instrument was invoked at the first moment that the Catholic agitation became troublesome; under its provisions the Catholic Committee was suppressed and two of its leading members—Dr. Sheridan and Mr. Kirwan—were prosecuted, tried before a packed jury, and, as a matter of course, condemned.

Now to every one of these occurrences the active mind of young Kenrick must have been painfully directed. They were the subject of discussion everywhere—by the family fireside, in the public mart, in the coffee houses, often in the pulpit. Is it matter for wonder that a young and ardent temperament like his should have been stirred to its depths by sympathy with the victims of so much wrong? More sluggish spirits had been stirred to action against it; finer natures like his quivered under its galling provocation.

If any outside student of historical development ever imagined that the relaxation of the more odious enforcement of the penal laws meant justice or leniency to the Catholic population, he labored under an egregious error. If priest-hunting had ceased, the prac-

tice of ostracism, public and private, reigned in unrestricted acerbity. But there was more than ostracism: there was no redress for injury for a Catholic against a non-Catholic. The statute of Kilkenny, which declared it no crime to kill one of "the Irishry," had been, it is true, repealed; but there was a law not less effective because not on the statute-book which forbade twelve men in a jury box from allowing a Papist the benefits of the British Constitution. The means by which this frustration of Magna Charta was secured is simplicity itself. It is the science of jury-packing. The Crown claims the right of unlimited challenge in all important trials; for the words, "Stand aside," at the calling of any particular juror's name it is not called upon to give any reason. On the other hand, the right of the accused to challenge is limited to a few without any reason assigned, and to a few more for cause shown—even in cases of high treason and treason-felony. That system flourishes in Ireland to the present day, although it was held up to the odium of the whole civilized world when it passed under the review of the three Law Lords of the British House of Peers in the famous appeal of Daniel O'Connell and his fellow-traversers against the Crown in the year 1844. Notwithstanding the solemn ruling of Lord Denman and his fellow peers, that O'Connell's conviction was illegal, because the system of trial by jury in Ireland, as illustrated in that particular case, was "a mockery, a delusion and a snare," that system still flourishes in all its pristine vigor, although it may not perhaps be so frequently called into requisition for Governmental purposes as it was in the days when Francis Patrick Kenrick began to observe the lurid phenomena of Irish politics. At the present time the evil is even more flagrant than it was in those days, because then no Catholic could possibly have a chance of serving on a jury, but now religion is no longer a bar against this class of citizen duty, and the odium of the "Stand aside" mandate, whenever it is heard in public court, is all the more reproachful to the shameless official who makes a bid for legal promotion or judicial position by resorting to it at the behest of the Government. Against this monstrous distortion of law the scathing invective of O'Connell was frequently heard clamoring in the early days of the past century. Political trials were frequent, and murder according to legal forms was perpetrated at almost every assize. It was a period when the power of the press was beginning to make itself felt. It was the day especially of pamphleteering. Ireland had been long conspicuous for successful resort to the pamphlet. Molyneux, Lucas and Swift—especially Swift—had had resort to this political weapon with deadly effect. While young Kenrick was in the chrysalis state of his intellect, between boyhood and adolescence,

some memorable pamphlets were circulated, and some memorable trials sprang out of their diffusion. One of these pamphlets had its origin in the trial and execution of a farmer named Barry on a trumped-up charge by a flagrantly packed jury. It was published by the well-known printer and bookseller, Hugh Fitzpatrick, of Capel street, Dublin; and the kernel of the offense charged was that it gave, besides the evidence establishing the complete innocence of the murdered man, a summary of the despotic laws under which the Irish Catholics groaned. The prosecutor in this case, as well as in a still more exciting one, that of the Crown *v.* Magee, an action for libel by the Lord Lieutenant, the Duke of Richmond, against the proprietor of the *Evening Post*, was Saurin, descendant of a French Huguenot refugee—an extremely rancorous partisan and Government hack. O'Connell defended both men, but he never hoped for a successful defense. Both were convicted and paid a monstrously heavy penalty in fine and imprisonment. But he took such a course as fastened the eyes of the world on the iniquity of the system under which his clients were victimized. He assailed the Attorney-General, the presiding Lord Chief Justice and the system of jury-packing with a boldness that stupefied every listener. He defied the jury to render a just verdict: they must be false to their oaths as Orangemen and false to their party if they elected to be true to the oaths they had taken as jurors to try the case without "fear, favor or affection." Thousands listened spellbound to his daring philippic; the crowd outside the Four Courts passed the lacerating sentences along as they fell from the intrepid orator's lips to the vaster crowds outside, and they were sped on the wings of the wind over the whole city ere they found their way into the press.

O'Connell's voice was the only agency in those days by means of which the national spirit was kept alive. That dark and melancholy epoch, depicted by Curran as the time when "Ireland, like a bastinadoed elephant, knelt at the feet of its rider," presented all the tokens of national death. The rebellion had been drowned in the blood of the people, and hope had fled with life.

Perhaps some clue to the aversion with which Francis Patrick Kenrick regarded O'Connell is to be found in the change which occurred in the latter's views on the subject of a salaried Irish clergy later on. This change estranged a good many of those who had formerly supported the Liberator with voice and purse. Among others it aroused in the formidable "J. K. L." the warmth of righteous anger, as will be seen by this extract from a speech delivered by him at a meeting in Carlow in the year 1825: "What my opinion was I declared in London to my right reverend brethren; I repeated it since in Dublin: that if the prelates were led to

approve of a provision emanating from the Treasury—if the ministers of Christ were to be paid by the ministers of State for dispensing the mysteries of God—then in that case I would not create dissension among them; but sooner than that my hand should be soiled by it, I would lay down my office at the feet of him who conferred it, for if my hand were to be stained with Government money it should never grasp a crozier, or a mitre ever afterwards be fitted to my brow. This was, and is, my fixed determination."

In Dr. Clarke's sketch of Francis Patrick Kenrick it is set forth that he learned his lifelong lesson of firmness in upholding the liberty of the Church, together with the virtue of meekness in suffering, from the example of the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius VII. Released from a long captivity in France by the event of Waterloo, that illustrious Pope had returned to Rome about the time when young Kenrick was commencing his clerical studies, and there was joy throughout the whole Catholic world, combined with pride in the heroism with which he had resisted every effort of Bonaparte's to bend the Papacy to his worldly ambition. But in Ireland this feeling was tempered with disappointment that a similar firmness had not been shown with regard to a design by no means less nefarious on the part of the British Government to gain the Papal consent to a legislative measure by means of which the British Crown would acquire the determining voice in the election of Catholic bishops, by the exercise of the veto. While the Pope was a prisoner in Bonaparte's hands his Pontifical authority was delegated, for certain purposes, to Monsignor Quarantotti; and it was for Ireland a most unfortunate circumstance that such was the case, inasmuch as the views of Catholic Ireland and those of the Delegate were on matters of high policy diametrically opposite. The Sovereign Pontiff was in ignorance of the real state of opinion on the matter, so that when he emerged from durance he was easily led by the artful whisperings of English Catholic emissaries despatched by the Government to lend some sanction to what had already been done by Monsignor Quarantotti. It would be difficult to conceive of any course more likely to be exasperating to a people who had fought for the faith so tenaciously as the Irish did, than that proposed by this weak and pliable Monsignor. His language, no less than his action, was obsequious and humiliating. In the Rescript announcing the dishonorable proposal he surrendered everything for which the Papacy, during many centuries, had successfully battled with the English Crown. He said, amongst other things: "It is better, indeed, that the prelates of our Church should be acceptable to the King, in order that they may exercise their ministry with his full concurrence, and also that there may be no

doubts of their integrity, even with those who are not in the bosom of the Church. For 'it behoveth a bishop' (as the Apostle teaches, I. Tim. iii., 7) 'even to have a good witness from those who are not of the Church.' Upon these principles we, in virtue of the authority intrusted to us, grant permission that those who are elected to and proposed for bishoprics and deaneries by the clergy may be admitted or rejected by the King, according to the law proposed. . . . If the candidates be rejected, others shall be proposed who may be acceptable to the King; but if approved of, the Metropolitan or Vicar-Apostolic, as above, shall send the documents to the Sacred Congregation here, the members whereof, having duly weighed the merits of each, shall take measures for the obtainment of canonical institution from His Holiness. . . . Another duty is assigned to the board . . . that they are charged to inspect all letters written by the ecclesiastical power to any of the British clergy, and examine carefully whether they contain anything which may be injurious to the Government, or anywise disturb the public tranquility. Inasmuch as communication on ecclesiastical or spiritual affairs with the Head of the Church is not forbidden, and as the inspection of the board relates to political subjects only, this also must be submitted to. It is right that the Government should not have cause to entertain any suspicion with regard to the communication between us. . . . Those matters only are to be kept under the seal of silence which pertain to the jurisdiction of conscience within us. . . . We are perfectly convinced that so wise a Government as that of Great Britain, while it studies to provide for the public security, does not on that account wish to compel the Catholics to desert their religion, but would rather be pleased that they should be careful observers of it. For our holy and truly divine religion is most favorable to public authority, is the best support of thrones and the most powerful teacher both of loyalty and patriotism."

This was a project which the Irish people at large stigmatized as an attempt to make a bishop a surpliced dragoon and a priest a policeman in the confession box. In the long course of the country's connection with Rome nothing ever occurred that went so dangerously near imperilling the stability of the tie. The Irish bishops and clergy, almost to a man, declared their hostility to it. The hierarchy held a meeting, put their sentiments on the subject on paper, in the shape of a strongly worded remonstrance, and despatched it, by the hands of Dr. Murray, coadjutor to the Archbishop of Dublin, to lay it at the feet of the Holy Father. But the protest was disregarded, for the English faction at Rome was then powerful, and the Pope had not had sufficient opportunity, since

his liberation, to look into the true merits and significance of the question. Dr. Murray (afterwards a warm friend of young Kenrick's) returned to Dublin with his tidings of evil, and the assembled prelates having heard the message, again formulated their solemn warning, this time in stronger phraseology still. They said:

"Though we sincerely venerate the venerable Pontiff as visible head of the Church, we do not conceive that our apprehensions ought to be removed by any determination of His Holiness adopted, or intended to be adopted, not only without our concurrence, but in direct opposition to our repeated resolutions and the very energetic memorial presented on our behalf, and so ably supported by our deputy, the Very Rev. Dr. Murray, who in that quality was more competent to inform His Holiness of the real state and interest of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland than any other with whom he is said to have consulted."

This outspoken resolution was signed by every one of the bishops, and Dr. Murray was again despatched to Rome, this time accompanied by Dr. Moylan, of Cork. Meantime a vehement agitation against the veto burst out all over the country, led at first by Daniel O'Connell and afterwards by the fearless "J. K. L."—the Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, Right Rev. Dr. Doyle. The opponents of the veto triumphed in the end, but not without a long struggle. We may be confident that young Kenrick was fully alive to all that was going on around him at this dangerous crisis; and if he chose Pope Pius VII. as his model of constancy in after life, it would be unreasonable to think that over this particular episode he took it as a safe or judicious example in dealing with questions into which he had not had the advantage of personally informing himself.

Justice demands, ere this episode be dismissed, that Monsignor Quarantotti should be held blameless as to the birth of the veto idea. Both in Mr. Plowden's History and the Rev. Father Brennan's "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland" the blame is laid at the door of the English Prime Minister, William Pitt. Lord Castlereagh was made the medium of the negotiation. In the year 1799 ten of the Irish bishops, constituting the Board of Maynooth College, held an official meeting in Dublin to consider a proposal from the Government of a State endowment to all the Catholic bishops, the *quid pro quo* to be acceptance of the veto rule. Besides this tempting offer, Lord Castlereagh, according to Father Brennan, gave solemn assurances that the acceptance of the Government's proposals would immediately secure a measure of emancipation for the Catholic population, and on the decision the fate of that great national question depended. "Thus beset," says Father Brennan, "by the proffers of the Minister on the one hand and by the alarm-

ing posture of the country on the other, the bishops already alluded to agreed 'that in the appointment of Roman Catholic prelates to vacant sees within the Kingdom such interference of Government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person appointed is just, and ought to be agreed to.' This statement was accompanied with an admission 'that a provision, through Government, for the Roman Catholic clergy of this Kingdom, competent and secured, ought to be thankfully accepted.'" Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, was one of those who agreed to this resolution, also the Primate, Dr. O'Reilly, of Armagh, as well as Dr. Moylan, of Cork. The transaction was kept secret for eleven years, and before the disclosure was made several of the prelates who signed the resolution had put their hands to another declaring it to be inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode previously observed in the nomination of the Irish Catholic bishops.

It is easy, therefore, to believe that Monsignor Quarantotti had been led into a mistake about the disposition of the Irish bishops on the one hand regarding the proposed veto, and of the Government on the other regarding the question of Catholic emancipation. The eminent Dr. Milner was quoted in Parliament as having sanctioned the offer of the veto, but he published a letter stating that he had no authority to sanction such an offer. It remains still unexplained from what quarter emanated the idea that such a proposal might find acceptance at the hands of the Irish hierarchy—possibly one of the numerous secret agents of William Pitt.

Looking back at this whole veto incident, pregnant as it was with evil potentialities to the whole Church, not merely in Ireland, but throughout the world at large, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that its origin is to be traced to a design to rend the Church by schism, and so destroy it, rather than to a political motive. Such a suspicion did it certainly generate in the quick and penetrating mind of Edmund Burke. That great thinker, who had never faltered in effort for the emancipation of the Catholics, thus masterfully portrayed the fallacies of the idea and the mischief it was likely to develop in case it were carried into effect, in his public "Letter to a Peer:" "Never were the members of one religious sect fit to appoint pastors to another. Those who have no regard for their welfare, reputation, or internal quiet will not appoint such as are proper. The Seraglio of Constantinople is as equitable as we are, and where their own sect is concerned, fully as religious; but the sport which they make of the miserable dignities of the Greek Church, the factions of the Harem, to which they make them subservient, the continual sale to which they expose and re-expose the same dignity, and by which they squeeze all the inferior orders of

the clergy, is nearly equal to all the other oppressions together exercised by Mussulmen over the unhappy members of the Oriental Church. It is a great deal to suppose that the present Castle would nominate bishops for the Roman Church of Ireland with a religious regard for its welfare. Perhaps they cannot, perhaps they dare not do it." To Dr. Hussey, Bishop of Waterford, Burke also wrote: "I am sure that the constant meddling of your bishops and clergy with the Castle, and the Castle with them, will infallibly set them ill with their own body. All the weight which the clergy have hitherto had to keep the people quiet will be wholly lost if this once should happen. At best you will have *a masked schism, and more than one kind, and I am greatly mistaken if this is not intended, and diligently and systematically pursued.*"

It is little wonder that clear-seeing Catholics should have opposed the veto proposition, when fair-minded Protestants like Burke saw in it so frightful a menace to the Church and society. Among the most strenuous and uncompromising opponents of the proposition was Bishop England. The warmth of the relations between this distinguished prelate and young Kenrick warrants the assumption that amongst the views which were held in common between them were those regarding the veto and its mischiefs. In the vigorous attitude assumed by Bishop Kenrick in regard to the trustee trouble in the Philadelphia Diocese we can discern his sentiments regarding the idea of lay control, whether by the State or the individual, over ecclesiastical interests and action. In the trustee system he encountered the veto practically in action, only under another name. This was how Bishop Hughes regarded it, as we may learn from the text of his vigorous denunciations of the abuse of the system, and the measures he took to neutralize the evil. The Bishop saw no outcome but heresy and schism if the trustee system were not checked or modified. It differed from the veto, therefore, only in design; its operation was precisely that which Burke anticipated in the passage above italicized.

All through his life love of his native land was a marked characteristic of Dr. Kenrick. Patriotism in him was inseparable from faith and virtue; it could have, indeed, no real existence without the one or the other. In the priest patriotism differs from the estimate of it formed by the layman, in very many cases. Though it be a shining virtue, its brilliancy is derived from the supernal light of faith and the constant communion with God which is the exalted privilege of the priest. In the performance of his sacred duty, in whatsoever region of the globe his lot may be cast, he perceives the first and most imperative service he is called upon to render on earth; and it is in the fulfilment of that grateful office that he

finds the solace and satisfaction which soften the asperity of prolonged exile and severance of all the ties that make home and fatherland so cherished of all other men. Whithersoever God calls is the true priest's land; and it is this fact which explains the phenomena so often witnessed of a dual loyalty in operation among the Catholic priesthood in the United States—an enthusiastic devotion to the flag and the Constitution of their adopted country, and an undying interest in the fortunes and interests of the land of their nativity. Hence in the exercise of his sacred office, either as priest or bishop, Francis Patrick Kenrick saw no lines of nationality or ethnology. All men were alike to him—brethren in Christ. Many races marched under the banners of the Crusaders, but they forgot not their own particular nationality. The charity of the priest must be larger still. He recognizes no foes, even among those against whom he is bound to fight. Mahometan and Buddhist alike appeal to his humanity and his charity, as well as fellow-Christian.

All those who were brought into close contact with Francis Patrick Kenrick, either as priest or as prelate, were profoundly struck by one great distinguishing characteristic. It is one that may be described as *sui generis*. Unquestioning faith is the inherent attribute of the Irish race, as a general rule. This faith takes the form of a childlike trust in God as well as a profound reverence for the truths of God and the things of His ministry. That faith was possessed by this typical Irishman in a pre-eminent degree. It shone translucently in his every act of life. There never lived a man who more implicitly trusted in God, placed his fate in His divine hands, or sought His guidance in the important things of life, than he. This sublime confidence was reflected in the cheerful glance of his eye, the turn of his speech, the kindly intonation of his voice. Every step he took in the planting and development of Church and seminary was marked by a sense of confidence begotten of the consciousness of support from on high. God had been called upon to light his human way, and God had not failed to answer in His own mysterious way. He needed all the strength derivable from such a sustaining source, for trials lay before him, and tasks were set for his hands to accomplish as great, perhaps, as had fallen to the lot of any individual priest or prelate since the early days of the Church.

This perfection of Christian faith was not a plant of slow growth in the case of either of the Kenricks. It was a family heritage. It manifested itself in the early instruction of the two children by their devout parents and in the responsive acceptance by their youthful minds of the truths of religion as naturally as the blessing of the sunshine and the balmy airs of heaven. That most beautiful attribute when seen in early boyhood, an ardent and unaffected

piety and a natural inclination toward the things of God and His Church, exhibited itself in both cases in a singular degree—so much so, indeed, that both were enrolled in a purgatorian sodality almost from infancy, and so little difference existed between their respective conceptions of their duty and responsibility as members of this spiritual band, although a nine years' interval separated their ages, that when Francis Patrick relinquished his place in the sodality on leaving for Rome, his brother was, notwithstanding his extreme youth, promoted to the vacant place. At this time they were respectively only eighteen and nine years of age! Boys rarely develop devotion so deep in very early years. They may be exemplary and attentive to what they are taught as articles of faith, but as a rule their minds are not deeply impressed with the profounder mysteries of the communion of saints, nor is the symmetry of the whole sublime edifice of salvation perceptible to the mind's eye as in a maturer period. It may be accepted as a certain token of the higher destiny when the tender mind of youth is thus illuminated by the rays of a faith which in other minds demands cultivation and a rationalizing process for the thorough comprehension of its logical basis. Only those familiar with Irish ideals can imagine with what joy the parents of children so blessed observe the symptoms of a religious vocation as they are thus gradually unfolded; and especially keen must be the delight and gratitude when such symptoms are not confined to one member of the family. To have given children to God is indeed the crowning delight of an Irish mother and the highest blessing that could be brought to any household, high or low.

This simple, abiding, absolute faith exists nowhere stronger than in Ireland. It has a royal virtue in it—like the glorious sun, which shines not for itself alone, but sheds its blessings over a whole mighty system. The faith of the Irish has made faith in many others, by merely beholding the sincerity and completeness of it. Subtle and magical must its influence be when it could make a mind like Montalembert's turn from its paths of cynical unbelief and confess the beauty and the power of a loving reliance on God. No agency was more decisive in bringing about Newman's conversion than the effect of Catholic faith on the people who professed it. How deeply he must have been impressed with the continuous, all-environing proofs of that faith which he saw while he sojourned in Ireland! If ever a scintilla of lingering doubt floated back on the waves of introspection, the entire abandonment of self in the worship of God which came under his eyes daily during his residence in the Green Isle must have annihilated it.

In his Apologia (part vii.) he says: "People say that the doctrine

of Transubstantiation is difficult to believe; I did not believe the doctrine till I was a Catholic. I had no difficulty in believing it as soon as I believed that the Catholic Roman Church was the oracle of God, and that she had declared this doctrine to be part of the original revelation. It is difficult, impossible to imagine, I grant—but how is it difficult to believe? Yet Macaulay thought it so difficult to believe that he had need of a believer in it of talents as eminent as Sir Thomas More before he could bring himself to conceive that the Catholics of an enlightened age could resist 'the overwhelming force of the argument against it.' 'Sir Thomas More,' he says, 'is one of the choice specimens of wisdom and virtue; and the doctrine of Transubstantiation is a kind of proof charge. A faith which stands that test will stand any test.' But for myself, I cannot indeed prove it, I cannot tell *how* it is; but I say, 'Why should it not be? What's to hinder it? What do I know of substance or matter? Just as much as the greatest philosophers, and that is nothing at all.' "

The Irish imagination certainly is equal to the requirement deemed impossible by this great divine, although it might be impossible to narrow down the conception or the idea to the terms of a proposition or a formula. Had Newman been an Irishman he need not have penned the confession of such an inability.

Another denotement of vocation of the two Kenricks was the faculty of receptivity. In the acquirement of knowledge and the desire of learning all things necessary for the life of the priest Francis Patrick Kenrick early displayed an aptitude and an earnestness which singled him out among his schoolmates.

He was only eighteen when he received the glad news that he was one of those selected to go to Rome to study at the far-famed Propaganda College. Fired with the prospect of drinking in learning at the fountain-head, of studying amidst the tombs of the Apostles, of imbibing from the wisdom of all nations and ages stored in the great libraries of the Church, of treading the ground sanctified by the footsteps of the martyrs and confessors of the early days, he started full of the noblest ambitions and enthusiasms. He came in the days in which the Church was jubilant with the awakening from the long nightmare of French persecution. Pius the Seventh had been restored to his long-bereaved people and capital, and the breath of freedom once more blew over Rome. The gentle bearing of the much-tried Pontiff made an indelible impression on the mind of the young Levite. The meekness and humility of the Divine Master were reflected in the spirit in which His Vicegerent had met persecution, and the constancy of the martyrs in the front he had shown to all the overtures of Bonaparte to lower the Church to the

status of a dependent portion of his civil system. These two lessons sank into the heart of the young student. They gave him those ideals of conduct which in after-life were to exercise so powerful an influence on his own career and the fortunes of the then infant Church in the New World.

The years of study at the Propaganda for young Kenrick were the span of Jacob's first service to Laban. In that span he had made himself famous. He had won renown as a scholar; he had gained a reputation for sanctity never surpassed by any student. Tried in the crucible for the sacred ministry, his assay had been made and the purity of the metal demonstrated. But he was seen to be the possessor of more than learning and sanctity: the discerning eye of Rome had noted in him those qualities which make leaders in the Church, the mind to conceive, the genius to plan, the patience to endure, and the charity to conquer. These were precisely the qualities that were needed in the new spheres where the prospects for the Church were beginning to unfold themselves before the eyes of her holy ambition. There came, at that moment, a call for help from the new field. Bishop Flaget, of Kentucky, was in sore need of some help in his mission, especially in the department of theology in his newly-established seminary. Father Kenrick had passed brilliantly in this branch. Though he had gained high honors in the department of science, his courses in sacred literature, especially theology, had been uncommonly distinguished; he was an exceptionally successful competitor, indeed, in every branch of clerical study—philosophy, literature, languages, science—and to these gifts of intellect he added the advantages of acumen, resolution, ready wit and that unfailing cheerfulness of disposition which is the characteristic of the mind whose whole trust is in God and is prepared to do whatever it recognizes as the Divine will at all times and under all temporal conditions. There is in the texture of the Irish mind a peculiar fitness for the study and mastery of theology and scholastic philosophy. A proof that it is not only capable of mastering the principles of analysis, but of the synthetical art as well, is afforded in the case of the famous doctor, Scotus Erigena, whose scheme was so grand and daring as to elicit from Dr. Erdmann, of Halle, a comparison between the brilliant Irishman and the Emperor Charlemagne: both created mighty empires doomed to perish with their own lives. Though it remained for the Angelic Doctor to blend harmoniously the principles of mediæval philosophy with the truths of the ancient school, the Irish doctor had grasped the idea not less boldly, though he failed to work it out on terms acceptable to Christian scholasticism. The Celtic spirit is indeed by nature attuned to the inaudible and intangible pulsations of the

realm of fancy and metaphysical suggestion; though in speaking of the illustration afforded by Scotus Erigena it cannot be forgotten that he is an example rather of the Celtic intellect carried to excess in the genius for subtlety than of the ultimate luminousness and grasp of the elusive and cryptic truth which makes the true theologian emerge from the struggling philosopher, like the butterfly from the chrysalis.

A blending of this genius for refinement in analysis with the power to arrange the tangled ends of argument in a symmetrical pattern, appears in the unfolding of Father Kenrick's mind. At the same time it is clear that this intellectual facility was incapable of forcing mentality into channels of mere abstraction, being counterbalanced by those more active practical elements which distinguish the man of affairs from the man of philosophic speculation. The usual landmarks of nature in human character, separating men into groups and assigning each his proper function in the great plan of life and thought, were absent in his case. His was a curious combination of the abstract and the real. The spiritual insight of the Irish mind blended in him with the instinctive capacity for the utilization of means which is claimed as an ear-mark of the less dreamy Anglo-Saxon stock.

The secret of this seems to be that to Francis Patrick Kenrick was given the identical gifts which made Patrick and Columba and Columbanus the great moulders of early Western civilization. They were, by Divine decree, possessors of the dual intellect. They were not only expounders, but creators, so to speak. It was not merely theirs to make desert places bloom as gardens, but they possessed the art of the gardener and the builder of the greenhouse as well. Such wonderful duality was especially needed for the mighty work opening up before the Church on the new continent; and those who follow the career of the two Kenricks cannot avoid the conviction that the development of the Church under their guidance, in their respective spheres of activity, was the manifestation of a principle too high for the flight of human reason.

John J. O'Shea.

ANGLO-SAXONISM AND CATHOLIC PROGRESS.

WE have seen, during the last couple of years, a curious attempt of politicians to unite this Republic with the British Empire in an alliance against the rest of the world. The base of this union, which is to undo the work of the American Revolution to a large extent, is the supposed community of Anglo-Saxon race and institutions between England and America. In fact, the term "Anglo-Saxon," untruthful as it is historically, has been brought into common use mainly for this purpose. The familiar "Briton" and "British" was good enough to satisfy English ears when their superiority over other nations was to be expressed. As it could hardly be expected that Americans could be drawn warmly to singing "Rule Britannia." or echoing "Britons never will be slaves," the expression Anglo-Saxon has come into favor in England and among admirers of English ways in our own land. As a matter of fact the Anglo-Saxons are but a fraction of the English people itself, and a fraction, too, which had less than almost any other in forming its institutions and character. The Norman Frenchmen founded the English Constitution and parliamentary institutions. Magna Charta owes its origin to the Norman Cardinal Langton and the French De Montforet. Since the eleventh century the rulers of England have been of almost every race but Anglo-Saxon. There have been Norman French and Angevin French, Welsh, Scotch and German Kings in England during the last eight hundred years, but no Anglo-Saxon. The expression itself was practically unknown fifty years ago. British superiority over foreigners in everything was the national faith of the English people until the growth of the United States forced attention on even the British mind. The vague Anglo-Saxon has since gradually displaced the traditional Briton in English Jingo language, but the meaning attached to both words is still the same in England.

What is stranger, a certain class among English Catholics are trying to bring the Anglo-Saxon myth, in a new form, within the pale of the Church. As the United States is invited to an "Anglo-Saxon" federation with England against the world, so a knot of Catholics in England is trying to set up a special alliance in religious interests between the Catholics of England and America. There is a distinct suggestion that their Catholicity is of a different type from that of other Catholic nations, and especially from what are called, in the true spirit of British insularity, the Latin races. The attempt to describe the Catholic Church as merely the Latin

Communion has been a favorite device with English Protestantism since the days of Charles I. and Laud. It is significant to find a strong echo of it to-day among Englishmen professing themselves Catholics. The Catholic Press of London furnishes numerous illustrations. The *New Era* confidently assures its readers that "the broad fact has to be faced that the Latin races have done their work, and the progress of the world, in the future, depends on the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races." The *Register,* commenting on the recent question of teaching Latin in the schools of the American Christian Brothers, lays down as an axiom that "the Latin mind will never understand the Anglo-Saxon." It further decides that "the highest tribunals of the Church in Rome proceed in a manner which no other courts in the world would consider tolerable." With genuine British inconsistency it admits that the Roman Judges in question are "absolutely free from any suspicion of wrong-doing or conscious unfairness," and that "the Roman bureaucracy is, in fact, a marvel of intellectual ability and moral rectitude," and then goes on to dwell on the importance of its ways of action being changed on British lines of procedure. One is reminded of the English housemaid who condemned the blue uniforms of the German infantry because "as every one in England knows blue is only proper for sailors and artillerymen."

Dislike of and an ignorant contempt for the Catholic nations of Europe, especially the French, has been a marked feature in the popular temper of Englishmen since the days of Cromwell. "I hate the French because they are all slaves and wear wooden shoes," is the expression of it which the novelist Sterne, in the last century, puts in the mouth of a crippled sailor begging his bread from charity and appealing to popular feeling. The cripple's further illustration of the liberties enjoyed by Englishmen at the time: "I was knocked down one night by a press gang, who then bade me stand up and serve His Majesty in the fleet," is significant. It is curious to find a similar spirit find utterance in the Catholic London *Register.* When a proposition was made a few months ago to bring some Benedictine monks from the Abbey of Solesmes to form a choir in the Westminster Cathedral, the editor loftily asked Cardinal Vaughan if "he did not know how the reputation of French Catholics stood in England," and wound up his remarks by declaring "it will be still more galling to know that the Cathedral is a standing reminder of the connection of Catholics with the Dreyfus case."

The attitude of a large body of English Catholics towards their French fellow-Catholics during the Dreyfus case is a striking example of the self-conceit and readiness to misjudge other nations which is so characteristically English. It reminded Irishmen forci-

bly of the language of the *Times* and other English papers during the Parnell trial and the Land League agitation. The new feature was the attempt to give it a character of Catholic zeal instead of English bigotry. A little knot of English Catholics are even said to have forwarded a memorial to the Sovereign Pontiff calling his attention to the action of some Hungarian Catholics, including Bishops, on an anti-Semitic question, and gravely pointed out to Leo XIII. that his predecessors had frequently interfered to protect Jews against persecution, and that they did not see why he should not do the same in Hungary!!!

The recent writings of the late Professor Mivart are a still stronger instance of the lengths to which Anglo-Saxon nationalism can lead professing Catholics. In the *Nineteenth Century* he declared seriously: "The Curia, *i. e.*, the Papal Administration, has learned nothing of the real conditions of mankind beyond its own surroundings. It has learned nothing of that dominant factor in the world, *our own race*. It has no glimmerings of the truth that the English-speaking peoples have thrown off despotism of whatever kind, and will never submit to the centralized tyranny which is the Curialists' only notion of government."

We have been long familiar with language of this kind in the English Protestant Press, but it is new to find a Catholic describing the administration of Leo XIII. and Pius IX. as a centralized tyranny. Equally remarkable is it to find the writer claiming the body of "English-speaking Catholics throughout the world" as his own race and assuming to act as spokesman for them all. The Catholics of Irish race certainly have no desire to see English methods of law and justice such as they are only too familiar with substituted for the methods of administration established by the wisdom of centuries and of countless saints in the highest tribunals of the Catholic Church.

Professor Mivart's utterances may be regarded as the eccentricities of an individual, but examples are not lacking to show that the desire to change the methods of government and religious action of the Church to English ideals is not confined to him. The London *New Era* recently announced that "unless the Church is to continue to be tied to moribund nations she must make progress in England, America and the British colonies." To assume that the whole Catholic world, outside the Anglo-Saxon sphere of influence, is moribund is a flight of self-conceit that would be natural on the platform of a Protestant missionary society, but that sounds like lunacy to the ears of a Catholic. To describe the two hundred and more millions of Catholics outside the pale of the English language—Italians, Frenchmen, Germans, Hungarians, Poles, Spaniards, Portuguese,

Flemish and Slavonian—as all moribund is a stretch of calm ignorance that can only be possible in the incomprehensible "Anglo-Saxon mind" which Rome is incapable of understanding, as is plaintively bewailed. It need not surprise us, then, to be told further that "humanly speaking the only field for the spread of the Church, at the present moment, would seem to be the English-speaking countries." The Divine commission to "teach all nations" is apparently forgotten by the writer.

But if the Church's mission is to be restricted to the English-speaking countries another power is introduced into the missionary field by journalistic authority.

"It is true," says the same paper, "the British Empire is predominantly Protestant. It is equally true that it makes for peace, for liberty, for law and order and for social and intellectual progress. A great and sacred trust has been committed by God to the British Empire, and the spread of that Empire is preparing the way for the spread of Christianity and a new era of Catholicity."

The assured confidence in the Divine nature of the trust committed to the rulers of Great Britain, and that its spread as an Empire is a first step towards the conversion of the world are typical of English Protestant ideas. It raises serious thought to find such utterances put forth as Catholic thought. One cannot help recalling that the people of England fell away from the Faith during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by following the principle of nationality before religion. The growth of a similar spirit to-day would give little prospect of the spread of Christianity. As a matter of fact, up to the present time the growth of the British Empire has done nothing for the conversion of the non-Christian lands that have fallen under its power. Since England's separation from the Church some twenty-five or thirty millions of pagans in various lands—Japanese, Chinese, Hindoos, Malays and American natives—have been brought to Christianity by the missioners of Spain, France, Italy and other Catholic countries. The French Society of Foreign Missions to-day keeps a population of a million and a quarter of Asiatic and African converts in the practice of Catholic life. There is scarcely a fiftieth of that number receiving instruction from English Catholic missioners; and the Protestant converts throughout the British Empire do not reckon a third of the converts of the French missioners alone. Where any indication of the likelihood of the spread of the Empire leading to a new era of Catholicity can be found passes our comprehension.

That the work, in a religious point, of the English Government and policy, from the days of Henry VIII. to those of George III., has been to take the people of England out of the Catholic Church is

an undisputed historical fact. That the national spirit of the English people during the greater part of that time has been distinctively and specially hostile to Catholicity is another fact. Elizabeth begged the Turkish Sultan in 1587 to send his galleys "against that idolator, the King of Spain," and assured him if he did so that "the proud Spaniard and the lying Pope will be struck down and God will protect His own and punish the idolators of the earth by the arms of England and Turkey." The Minister of Queen Victoria, at the time of the massacres of the Syrian Catholics, in 1860, declared that the safety of the Turkish power was a greater object to Her Majesty's Government than the protection of the lives of Christians. It is hard to find in such a system any preparation for the spread of the Faith or any warrant for the supposition that the Anglo-Saxon race is divinely chosen to advance Catholicity. It will throw light on this subject if we examine what is the actual number of Catholics of English race among the twenty or thirty millions of Catholics in the British Empire and the United States at the present moment, and to what extent those Anglo-Saxon Catholics are promoting the growth of a new era of Catholicity. We shall find that the English-speaking Catholics are emphatically as little Anglo-Saxon as are the Catholics of France or Spain, either in origin, sympathies or religious thought.

The last census estimated the Catholics of this country at somewhat less than ten millions. We believe this to be an underestimate, but it can be used as a basis to determine the number of Anglo-Saxons in the Catholic body here. The census of Ireland gave a population, which is certainly not Anglo-Saxon, of three and a half millions of Catholics. The Canadian returns showed about two million Catholics in less than five of a total population. Of these two millions nearly a million and a half were classed as French in language, the other half million Celtic Irish and Celtic Scotch. It is not easy to know whether the French Canadians or the French Catholics of the Mauritius and part of the English West Indies are included in the "English-speaking" Catholics by the champions of Anglo-Saxonism as a force in the Church.

A similar question needs to be answered with regard to the twelve hundred thousand Hindoo and Ceylonese Catholics in the Indian Empire and the two hundred thousand Maltese, not to speak of such Catholics of the Uganda Mission as escaped butchery a few years ago at the hands of Captain Lugard and his Maxim guns while building up the British Empire there. Whether people who do not use the English language can be classed as English-speaking Catholics seems at least doubtful.

The Australian colonies and New Zealand have a Catholic popula-

tion of about a million, somewhat under twenty-five per cent. of the total. In South Africa fifty or sixty thousand is the highest estimate of the Catholics of European race, and a still smaller number in British Guiana. The whole Catholic population then of the British colonies is about five and a half millions, or about two-thirds of the number of Malay Catholics in the Philippines. The Anglo-Saxon element, or the body which either in race or sympathies is connected with English ideas, does not amount to one hundredth part of these five and a half millions.

In Great Britain, unlike other countries of Europe, no census returns have been made of the religions of the population. In Scotland reports which give evidence of accuracy have been prepared by the Archbishops. They give four hundred and twenty thousand Catholics in a total of four millions, or about a tenth. A considerable part, a fourth, or perhaps a third, is made up of Gaelic-speaking Highlanders who retained their Catholicity during the centuries of persecution that followed the overthrow of the Government of Queen Mary. The rest are all but exclusively Irish. There is a close bond of national feeling between the Irish and the Scotch Gaelic Catholics, but none whatever between either and the Anglo-Saxons, or, as the name is usually written in Scotland, Sassenachs.

In England itself the Catholic Directory estimates the whole Catholic population at a million and a half, or six per cent. The proportion is noticeably smaller than even in Scotland. Of that million and a half at least a million are Irish by birth or parentage, and residence in England has developed no Anglo-Saxon sympathies amongst either class. The number of Catholics of English race who kept the Faith through the Penal Laws was less than one hundred thousand at the end of George III.'s reign. If it has doubled since that is the largest estimate that can be made to-day of old English Catholics. The Oxford movement has added probably two hundred thousand members to the Church during the reign of Victoria. The total of Catholics who, in any sense, may be called Anglo-Saxons, who either in race, sympathies or thought are in any sense English, cannot be counted at over half a million among the two hundred and fifty million Catholics of the world or the eleven millions in the Empire. If we wish to use the term "English-speaking" to describe those eleven millions we should add "not English race" as a matter of accurate expression.

The only settlement of Catholics of English race in the territory now comprised in the United States was Lord Calvert's colony of Maryland. It numbered about four hundred families, a large part of whom, however, were Irish, not English. In every other English colony the first Catholic population was exclusively Irish. It

was so in Pennsylvania, in New York and in New England. In fact, before the Revolution in those countries Catholic was practically synonomous with Irish. In Louisiana, Missouri, Illinois, Michigan and Indiana the original settlers were French Catholics, who have formed no inconsiderable element in the subsequent population. In Florida, Texas, California and New Mexico the first Catholic population was Spanish. Of the mass of immigrants from Europe that has built up the people of these United States during the century the official records show that scarcely a tenth is of English origin. As Catholics in England have never been a twentieth of the population during that time, it is accurate to state that they cannot have given over a two-hundredth part to the existing American population. Counting the original English Maryland settlers, the converts made on American soil and the arrivals from Europe, it is impossible to reckon the Anglo-Saxon element in the Catholic population here at two per cent., one-fiftieth of the whole. Clearly any supposed incapacity of the "Latin mind" for understanding the Anglo-Saxon is not a question of vital import to American more than to Irish Catholics. There are more Spanish-American Catholics than Anglo-Saxon; there are at least five times as many of French origin, nearly the same number of Italians and fully four times as many Poles and Catholic Slavonians in America to-day, without taking into reckoning the much larger elements of German and Celtic race. However problematical the number of Anglo-Saxons in the whole population may be, it is almost infinitesimal among the body of American Catholics.

If the Anglo-Saxon race is thus small, numerically, among the Catholics of America, the distinctive ideas which bear that name, and such as are expressed by the writers in the London press whom we have quoted are positively repugnant to the great mass among them. The idea of England having a special mission to prepare the world for Catholicity appears little less than idiotic to men of Irish race. They know by experience, or have learned from their fathers, what is the real nature of the "peace, liberty and law and order" for which the British Empire makes. They know that the so-called liberty of Great Britain leaves the Irish Catholic to-day distinctively below his Protestant fellow-countrymen in the law, in education, in the public service and in everything connected with temporal prosperity. They know that whatever of liberty Catholics enjoy to-day in the British Empire was conceded through fear, not granted by a liberality which had any existence save in the lying proclamations which have filled the history of Ireland since the days of Elizabeth. They know that the principles on which the Government of this country has been founded, the rule of the people as individuals, the

incompetency of a State to make a religion, the rejection of military force as an instrument of government, are not only not English, but distinctively opposed to the prevalent ideas of the English people.

Of the other race elements which go to make the American Catholic population there is none which holds sympathy with the peculiar ideas of Englishmen, none which feels any desire for a closer bond with English Catholics than those of other lands. The Catholics of German race here certainly do not. The French, Spanish and Italian Catholics are not worried by the supposed difficulty of "understanding of the Anglo-Saxon mind by the Latin." Anglo-Saxon ideas have not entered their thought in questions of religion. They want no lessons on social or intellectual progress from English sources. Indeed, the Catholics of English race show as little desire of closer association with English ideals in religion as any other class. The book of the late Rev. Father Young, "Protestant and Catholic Countries Compared," is one of the most effective answers we know to the theory that Catholic nations are moribund, or that the future of the world is in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races. Yet Father Young was himself not only of English race, but of English birth; but he was "Catholic first and Englishman after," as every true Catholic must be, whatever his nationality. The Divine claim on man's allegiance is stronger than any human claim.

Having now examined the numerical importance of Anglo-Saxons among the English-speaking Catholics, we shall try to find out how far facts warrant the supposition that the spread of the British Empire is a preparation of the world for Christianity and a new era of Catholicity. At the date of the American Revolution, when the Penal Laws of William of Orange were still in force and the Catholic Church under an absolute ban through the dominion of the English Crown, that dominion had a population of about fifteen millions. Three millions were in the American colonies and about twelve millions in the British Islands. Of the twelve millions at least two and a half were Catholics, almost entirely Irish. Those two and a half millions had been reduced to abject poverty by the policy of England continued during the two previous centuries. The externals of religion—churches, schools, religious orders—had been swept away by persecution, but the Catholic faith survived. It survived, as it did in Japan down to our own day, under confiscation and every punishment an absolute government could inflict. The separation of the American colonies from the British dominions brought the first step towards toleration to the oppressed Catholics. With all their hatred of the Catholic Church, the ministers of George

III. realized that the fate of England might be sealed by an Irish counterpart of the American Revolution. They grudgingly conceded a small modicum of civil rights to Catholics in 1778, followed, after the outbreak of the French Revolution, by a larger one in 1793. The hatred of the English people to everything Catholic continued long afterwards. The Gordon riots in London were a striking illustration of that point; and later, in the insurrection of 1798, the burning of Catholic chapels by the British troops in Ireland was an equally strong one. The excesses of the early Revolutionary leaders in France, strange as it may seem, were the first cause of a revulsion of feeling towards Catholics in England. The English monarchy found itself in a death struggle for existence with Republican France, and it extended some favor to the victims of revolutionary frenzy, even if they professed the Catholic Faith. It was not, however, that the old anti-Catholic spirit was dead either in the Government or the people of England. Catholic priests were often expelled from English settlements in Australia, in Newfoundland and elsewhere by arbitrary action of military officials. The idea of allowing Catholics to take any part in public life, to find place in Parliament or among the officials of Government was held incompatible with the spirit of the Constitution. In England it was unsafe even to build a Catholic church, except in some secluded place, for many years after the relaxation of the Penal Laws. At the same time the liberty enjoyed by every class of English subjects was as loudly proclaimed as is to-day the supposed liberality of the English Government and people to the Catholic Church.

The action of the English Catholics who had held the faith under persecution is a curious illustration of the "new era of Catholicity" which may be expected from the prevalence of Anglo-Saxon sentiments in religious ideas. The first relaxation of the Penal Code, in 1778, was followed by the formation of a committee of prominent English Catholics to obtain further concessions of elementary liberties, and also to suggest appropriate action to their co-religionists. This body suggested as the most suitable mode of conciliating the good feeling of the Protestant majority that English Catholics should elect their bishops without any reference to the Head of the Church, or, as they styled him themselves, "the Bishop of Rome." They urged that statues should not be used in Catholic churches, lest Protestant prejudices might thereby be shocked. They also objected to the introduction of religious orders as unnecessary and dangerous. They declared that not only did they not recognize the deposing power, which in the Middle Ages had been exercised by the Popes with the approval of Christendom, but that the claim to such a power at any time was contrary to Catholic doctrine and

heretical. The majority of the committee was prepared to embody this outrageous theory, which virtually condemned the whole mediæval Catholic Church as heretical in an oath of allegiance to George III. They styled themselves by the new name of "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" to emphasize their specially English character in the Catholic communion. It was only the zeal and energy of Bishop Milner that prevented this extraordinary concession of principles being carried into law as the English idea of Catholicity.

The line of conduct of the Irish Catholics at the same time brings out clearly the difference of national character in matters of religion between the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic races. The hostility of sucessive English Governments had borne equally on the Catholics of both races. The Irish "Recusants" had suffered, in a material point, far worse than the English. They had been deprived almost wholly of their own land, and might only live on it as laborers or tenants, at the absolute mercy of landlords of alien race and creed. The pressure of famine was as common among them in the eighteenth century as it has been in the nineteenth. The violence of the Gordon anti-Catholic riots in London was repeated a hundred times among the Catholic Irish peasantry in "ninety-eight." They had no men of wealth or British nobility among them, as the English Catholics had, yet, all through the half century that followed the first measure of toleration, the Irish emphasized their devotion to their faith in all its integrity, while their English co-religionists were trying to hide the very name of Catholic among themselves. The popular outburst of 1814 against the proposition to allow the Protestant Government a veto on the appointment of Catholic bishops shows how radical was the difference between the sentiments of the English and the Irish Catholics. Not less so was their rejection of salaries from the State to the Catholic priesthood, offered in 1829 by the Duke of Wellington. They submitted to the disfranchisement of the whole body of small freeholders among themselves as the price of freedom for their religion, but they refused to accept any aid from a non-Catholic source which might endanger the independence of their religious guides. They had kept their hierarchy unchanged all through the dreary centuries of persecution by that spirit of independence, while the episcopate of Catholic England had been swept out of existence, and that spirit remained as vigorous in the days of O'Connell as it had been in those of Hugh O'Neill, when he demanded freedom of religion from Elizabeth.

This contrast between the English and Irish races in religious sentiment is one which deserves serious consideration in America to-day. Some among Catholics, both here and in England, seem to think that the special characteristics of the Catholics of this coun-

try and the British Empire, especially the disinclination to allow interference, in religious matters, of political authorities, and the equal right of rich and poor in the ministrations and teaching of the Church, are in some way due to English character and the influence of English institutions. To this supposition history gives absolute denial. The Celtic Irish, who had no part in forming the institutions of England and who were more foreign indeed to everything English than almost any nation of Europe, have in simple fact given to the Church whatever special character it has in English-speaking countries. The Anglo-Saxons have, indeed, strongly marked characteristics of their own, and those characteristics show themselves among some English Catholics. The writers quoted in this article are typical specimens, but decidedly not of the great Catholic body which uses the English language as its speech. The voice may be English, but the soul is unmistakably Celtic among this body.

During the American Revolution the Irish statesman, Edmund Burke, declared that he was not equal to the task of drawing an indictment against a nation. We acknowledge a similar weakness, though we confess it appears not to be felt at all by the average champions of Anglo-Saxon claims. The London writer who brands the French Catholics with complicity in the Dreyfus case is a good example. We would not, and in truth we could not, affix sweeping charges of any kind on the English Catholics or the English people. We believe the great majority of English Catholics to-day are as sincerely devoted to their faith as are the Maltese or the French Canadians. We honor noble names among them. Cardinal Newman, Father Faber, Lingard, Bishop Milner and a host of other English Catholics are as dear to us as Archbishop Carroll, Oliver Plunkett, Dom Bosco, Lacordaire or other distinguished men in the Church. When, however, we have to consider the question, how far facts warrant assertions that the Church's future is in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon race, or that the spread of the British Empire is a preparation for Catholic progress, we feel it a matter of justice to ask how far such assumptions are justified by facts.

The English people—Saxon, Danish and Norman—was a part of the Catholic Church during a thousand years before Henry VIII. separated from its communion. During all those years its faith and practice were the same as those of the Catholic peoples of Ireland, France, Spain, Germany or Italy. At the rise of Protestantism the new doctrines found no more favor among the English people than among the French. They appear to have been sincerely attached to the Church and the Holy See as their religious guides. Men like

More and Fisher and Warham show that high and enlightened personal sanctity existed among English Catholics. The peculiar events which separated England from the Church show, however, certain national characteristics which cannot command admiration, and which are very different from the ideas of independence and sturdy courage that are popularly supposed to be typically Anglo-Saxon. The King, after years of life as a devout and zealous Catholic, and after receiving the title of "Defender of the Faith" from the Sovereign Pontiff, suddenly threw off that faith and ordered his people, through a packed Parliament, to follow his example. His motives were public and generally reprobated. They were to contract a marriage regarded by the morality of the Catholic world as adulterous, and to enrich himself by seizing the property of the monasteries, which was also the public provision for relief of the poor and education. The men of highest character in England, Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher, were executed for refusing to sanction the King's new religion. The people rose in arms, in a large part of England, and obtained a promise of change in the royal action, but as soon as troops were let loose on them the nation, however reluctantly, conformed outwardly to the new system of religion, opposed as it was to their belief and sympathies. When Mary came to the throne the great majority of the English people welcomed the restoration of the Church. Five years later they permitted her sister Elizabeth to proscribe the Catholic Faith again. The only explanation of this course is that political interests held a higher power over the minds of the English people than spiritual interests. They believed in the Catholic doctrines, but they were not ready to make sacrifice of their temporal interests for the things of the unseen world. It can hardly have been a love of freedom which made a nation take its religion from the orders of its sovereign. Yet such was the course of the English people. It was the same spirit which, two hundred years later, made the English Catholic Committee call their Catholic forefathers heretics for the sake of political privileges. Elizabeth herself, while establishing a Protestant State Church and sending her Catholic subjects to death for refusing to accept its doctrines, appears to have sacrificed her own belief to political interests. While describing the Catholic world as idolators to the Turkish Sultan she retained the crucifix in her own chapel, and she freely expressed her dislike of a married clergy while sanctioning its establishment. Such was the English spirit in religion as shown by the history of three hundred years. That it has nothing in common with the spirit of the Catholics who kept the Faith all through in Ireland, or who planted it in the United States, in Canada, in Australia and wherever the English tongue is spoken will not be claimed

by any thinking man. This should never be forgotten when there is mention of English-speaking Catholics.

In view of these facts, let us see how far the spread of the British Empire, or the nature of its policy, can be regarded as favorable to the progress of Catholicity. Its government is often contrasted with those of Catholic countries, such as France or Italy, where a faction in control shows hostility to the Church. The fact is that the anti-Catholic spirit displayed in such cases is but a temporary and modified copy of the policy which has ruled the English Government for over three hundred years. We feel sorrow that the French people should allow its rulers to proscribe Catholic religious orders in schools and hospitals or that the Catholics of Italy should permit the spoliation of churches and monasteries, but their apathy is far less than that of the English Catholics who allowed Henry and Elizabeth to change the whole religious practice of the nation at will. When the French Revolutionists treated the Church as Henry had treated it in England a few years ended their persecution, while in England it continued unremitted till Catholics were almost wiped out of existence. What the grounds are for attributing any special favor for Catholicity to the present British Government passes our comprehension, yet such seems to be the serious belief of some English writers. Professor Mivart complained, in apparent seriousness, of "the extraordinary hostility of the Vatican to England and our Empire, throughout which the Catholic Church enjoys such signal advantages and favors." It may clear up this point if we examine the real nature of the progress of the Church in the British Empire during the reign of the present Queen.

At the accession of Victoria, the British Government was more directly hostile to the Catholic Church than any other in Europe. Intercourse with the Pope, in any form, was forbidden by law. The profession of Protestantism was absolutely required as a condition for ascending the throne, and even marriage with a Catholic was forbidden to members of the royal family. The mother of the Queen had abjured her religion before marrying the Duke of Kent. She was received back to the Church shortly before her death, a fact which speaks strangely for the religious principles prevailing in the court. The highest offices of State, such as the Viceroyalty of Ireland, were barred against Catholics. So were the English universities, and in Ireland, though Catholic students might attend the lectures of Trinity College, they were allowed no share in its scholarships, and formal profession of Protestantism was required of all the professors and fellows. The oath taken by the Queen at her coronation and also the oath required of all non-Catholic members of Parliament not only bound them to maintain the Protestant Establish-

ment in Church and State, but even included an express denial of several Catholic doctrines, including Transubstantiation. Though Catholics had been allowed seats in Parliament since the Catholic emancipation act, the whole administration of the law, of local government and education, even in Catholic Ireland, was confined to Protestants. Such were the "signal favors" which Catholics were receiving from the British Government at the beginning of the present Queen's reign.

While such was the attitude of the British Empire towards the Catholic Church, the Catholics of Prussia and other German non-Catholic States, such as Hanover, and of Holland were on a footing of equality before the law with all other subjects. The King of Prussia or Wurtemburg or the Russian Czar had no scruple about maintaining embassies in Rome or visiting as friends the Head of the Catholic Church. It was only in "free" England that all intercourse was forbidden with the Sovereign Pontiff, only there that the Sovereign had to swear to personal disbelief in Catholic doctrines. The public schools and universities, both classes and chairs, were open to the Prussian and Dutch Catholics freely, while even entrance to the lecture halls of Cambridge or Oxford was only to be obtained by formal profession of Protestantism. It is difficult to see how special favor to the Church can be attributed to English institutions or Government at Victoria's accession. England was then preëminently the most anti-Catholic government in Europe.

If the Government was anti-Catholic the public opinon of the English people and press was even more bigoted. During thirty years after Catholic emancipation no Catholic was elected to Parliament in England except one. This was the brother of the Duke of Norfolk, who represented the small town of Arundel, a pocket borough of the Norfolk estate. In any other British constituency a Catholic candidate would be pelted from the hustings. In many towns a priest could hardly appear on the streets without danger of insult or assault. Burning the Pope in effigy was a favorite amusement of the English populace up to forty years ago. How far all this indicated any specially favorable field for Catholic progress in England is hard to see. It is true that priests were not subject to banishment as such, as they had been seventy years before, that schoolmasters might teach, churches be built and that fines were no longer imposed on Catholics for non-attendance at Protestant service. These were gains indeed, but they were not of a nature to warrant any special credit to English institutions, when nearly every other civilized land recognized the rights of Catholics to hold their faith and at the same time all the rights of citizens or subjects.

As to the progress that the Faith has made since in the British

Empire, it is hardly such as to justify the assertion that its government or social conditions are favorable above others to Catholic life. There has been a remarkable movement towards Catholic doctrines, once hated by a large section of Englishmen, since the Tractarian movement. Many converts, perhaps as high in numbers as one per cent. of the population and equal to the whole of the old English Catholics, have returned to the Catholic Church. There has been a notable decline in the bigotry which was so marked a feature of English character at the beginning of Victoria's reign, but there has also been a large growth of infidelity and hostility to Christianity in any form throughout England. The old dislike of Catholics still exists, but it prefers to justify itself on supposed race superiority rather than religious grounds. The attitude of the English Press towards the French people on the occasion of the Dreyfus case, or towards the Irish people during the Land League movement, is a typical example. Anglo-Saxonism has to some extent replaced Protestantism as the national creed of Englishmen. We can hardly see how the change makes for the growth of the Catholic Church.

We may judge the value of the "signal advantages and favors" which the Church enjoys in the British Empire, according to Mr. Mivart, and how far the spread of that Empire is making for Catholic progress by comparing the actual number of Catholics under its rule to-day with what they were sixty years ago. It is a fact that the Catholic population of the British Islands is now hardly two-thirds what it was at the beginning of Victoria's reign. England, Ireland and Scotland then had eight millions of Catholics in a total of twenty-five millions. To-day they have five and a half in a population of thirty-three millions. Catholics were then a third of Victoria's subjects in Europe. To-day they are hardly a sixth. Adding in the whole Catholic English-speaking population of Canada, Australia and all other British colonies, there are now a million fewer Catholics in the Empire than there were when Victoria came to the throne. The Catholics of the German Empire have increased from eleven to fourteen millions since 1875; those of Holland nearly three-quarters of a million since 1840. In every other country of the world—in Austria, in Switzerland, in Belgium, in France, Italy and Spain—there has been a notable increase in the number of Catholics. In the British Empire alone there has been a steady decrease. This fact is not altered in its nature because it is due to the disappearance of Irishmen mainly. Then, as now, they formed the one large Catholic population within the Empire, and if its policy dooms that population to destruction or expatriation its policy is distinctly hostile to Catholic progress. The building of churches

and schools and the increase in the clergy and hierarchies of England and Scotland are poor compensation indeed for the extermination of the Catholic people of Ireland.

It is with no feeling of national jealousy that we have shown how false is the assertion that the spread of the British Empire is a preparation for Catholic progress. So far it has been the one power which has absolutely made the number of Catholics among its subjects decrease, while Catholics are growing in numbers in every other land. Its action on the Irish Catholics to-day is similar to its action on the English Catholic body from the days of Elizabeth to those of George III. Year by year they are diminishing, as if struck by some fatal disease, wherever the English flag flies. The remedy will come in God's time, but it will not come from any benignant influence of English ideas or unfounded assertions of Catholic progress under English institutions. The facts speak for themselves.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

THE STORY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

III.—SALVAGE FROM THE WRECK.

IT cannot be denied that the downfall of the Catholic religion in Scotland dates from the Parliament of 1560. Not that the change from Catholicism to Protestantism was immediately effected, for it was the work of years; but the Reformers and their supporters by their high-handed measures made sure of the ultimate success of their cause. When the rites of religion had been proscribed by law, monasteries cast down and their property confiscated and heretical teachers thrust into the places of the orthodox clergy, the nation was rendered powerless to resist the total overthrow of the Church. Individuals might oppose the new creed forced upon them, but isolated efforts were ineffectual against the united strength of powerful nobles and prelates.

The attitude of the people as a body towards the Reformation is a question full of interest to the Catholic student of history; it is one, nevertheless, upon which little can be learned from Protestant historians. These latter, being full of sympathy for the movement, though frequently disapproving of the means used to bring it about, have little interest in studying the dispositions of the nation towards the new doctrines. Indeed, some would seem to consider the staunch Catholics of those days as unworthy of notice, so priceless

the gifts offered to them by the despised Reformers! Thus one writer speaks of the latter as men "who earnestly desired to see a purer faith and a more primitive worship established in Scotland;" who "were led to the study of the Scriptures by their love of the truth;" who when "dragged before ecclesiastical tribunals refused to purchase their lives at the price of a recantation."[1] Another and more recent writer seems to regret the troubles brought upon the country by the Reformation, while he has no word of condemnation for the movement in itself. "If James (V.)," he says—he is alluding to Henry VIII.'s attempts to convert that monarch—"could only have come under conviction, and been the subject of a gracious awakening to the truth, it would have been happy for Scotland."[2] The irony of the first part of the sentence does not contradict the wish expressed, as the context shows. It is, however, only fair to quote the words of the same writer with regard to the Reformation. "This is not a topic," he says, "on which it is easy to be impartial. Protestant historians have seldom handled it with impartiality, and their suppressions, glosses and want of historical balance naturally turn into opposition the judgment of a modern reader."[3] Mr. Lang has striven to be impartial, as every unprejudiced reader of his interesting volume must allow, and has succeeded, as far as it is possible for one who is not a Catholic, in giving an unbiased account of this confessedly difficult period of history.

How then did the nation receive the changes in religion brought about by the legislation of 1560? In the opinion of one historian they embraced them eagerly. Speaking of the difficulties Mary Stuart had to encounter, Mr. Hill Burton has no hesitation in affirming that "she, a thorough member of the Church of Rome, had come among a people of whom *the greater portion*, including all the ruling men, had become Protestants."[4] The words here emphasized by italics seem scarcely borne out by the evidence which will be brought forward presently. We know from Knox and other contemporary writers that many of the common people joined the reforming party; for the "rascal multitude" that played a prominent part in violating sacred places could only have belonged to the lowest class. It is scarcely worth while lingering here to discuss the "conviction" and "gracious awakening"—to use Mr. Lang's sarcastic terms—of such converts. Again, several of the nobles joined the ranks of the Reformers, but we have already seen Mr. Hill Burton's estimate of their too apparent motives,[5] while Mr. Lang enumerates among the factors of the Reformation "the passions of the exemplary nobles, whose disinterested conduct," he says with bitter

[1] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 40. [2] Andrew Lang: "History of Scotland" (1900), Vol. I., p. 432. [3] Ibid, p. 421. [4] "History of Scotland," Vol. IV., p. 178. [5] *Vide*, *American Catholic Quarterly*, April, 1899, p. 60.

irony, "shines on almost every page of this book."[6] As to the bulk of the nation, it cannot be maintained that they readily acquiesced in the changes. It has been already shown in a former article[7] that the clergy had woefully neglected their duty of regular and systematic teaching, and that would account for the falling away of some. That "the greater portion" had already become Protestants when Queen Mary arrived in Scotland, one year only after the Parliament had formally declared Catholicity illegal, can scarcely be granted. Had it been the case, the disaffection of the people for the old religion would have been more evident than it was, and their attachment to the new doctrines would have been witnessed to by the leaders of the movement. The examination of this disaffection towards the one and attachment to the other will help us to arrive at a more satisfactory solution of the temper of the nation at that period as regards religion.

Had the people as a whole been disaffected towards the Catholic Church we could scarcely expect to meet with the abundant evidence which exists of the interest taken by them in all that concerned its welfare and the carrying out of its worship during the period that immediately preceded the Reformation. Such evidence is found in the many and substantial benefactions bestowed upon the Church by people belonging to almost every class of the community. A free gift of one's substance is an evident proof of one's appreciation of the object of the donation, and if this principle be applied to the benefactions in question we are able to arrive at some idea of the appreciation which Scottish men and women living in the early part of the sixteenth century had for the Catholic Church, its ministers and its ordinances.

It is a striking fact that many of the Collegiate churches of Scotland were founded only a few years before the downfall of religion. This alone speaks strongly in favor of the hold which the Church still had upon the wealthier portion of the people. The Collegiate churches partook of a conventual nature without being monastic. They were served by a certain number of secular canons under the rule of a provost, and in them the Divine Office of the Church was daily and regularly chanted. Sometimes they served as parish churches, at other times they often had a school or hospital attached to them, but upon all rested the obligation of regular and orderly divine service. Their foundation dated from the end of the fourteenth century to the period of the Reformation, and their number and importance afford a striking proof of the faith and piety of many Scottish hearts in an age which has been stigmatized as godless and selfish where it was not puritanical.

---

[6] Lang: "History of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 433. [7] April, 1899.

In selecting examples it will be well to restrict our investigations to the sixteenth century alone; sufficient will be found during that period to bear out the assertion that love for the Church and her rites was still strong in Scotland.

The royal foundation of St. Mary and St. Michael in the Castle of Stirling, although it scarcely comes within the scope of our enquiry, may be allowed to head the list. It was made by James V. in 1501, and provided for a dean, sub-dean, cantor, sacristan, treasurer, chancellor, archpriest, succentor, sixteen chaplains, six singing boys and a master of choristers. It was richly endowed by its royal patron with the revenues of some ten parish churches. In 1505 John, Lord Sempill, founded the Church of St. Mary at Loch Winnoch, in Renfrewshire, for a provost, vicar, sacristan, six chaplains and two singing boys. The chaplains included a schoolmaster, organist and master of the "song school." The clergy, it may be noted, wore scarlet hoods lined with lamb's wool. Sir William Myreton, in conjunction with the Prioress of Haddington, founded in 1517 the Collegiate Church of Crail in the Diocese of St. Andrews. It was served by a provost, sacristan and ten prebendaries. The church was of considerable size, being 135 feet in length. The Church of St. Mary and St. Anne was founded in 1528 at St. Thenew's Gate, Glasgow, by James Houston, sub-dean of the Cathedral and rector of the University of Glasgow. The foundation provided a provost, to be appointed by the Abbot of Kilwinning for the time being, eight canons and three choristers. This church received rich endowments from various sources; Bishop Elphinstone, of Aberdeen; Canon Muirhead and Sir Martin Reed, chaplain of the Castle, being among its benefactors. Four public Masses were celebrated daily, two of them at least being sung to note. On the founder's anniversary each year thirty poor men and matrons received doles of money after assisting at the *requiem*, and twenty-eight scholars received bounties. This church was spoken of colloquially as "Laigh" or Low Church, to distinguish it from the High Church or cathedral.

To come still nearer to the Reformation period, the Magistrates of Peebles, with the assistance of Lord Hay of Yester, founded a collegiate body at St. Andrew's Church, Peebles, as late as 1542. There were nine prebendaries attached to the institution. A year later the church of Cullen, in Banffshire, was made collegiate by the generosity of Alexander Ogilvie of Deskford. Its staff comprised a provost, six prebendary clergy and two choristers. The last to be mentioned, and one of the latest ecclesiastical foundations before the Reformation, was the Collegiate church of Biggar, in Lanarkshire. It was founded in 1545 by Malcolm, Lord Fleming, for a

provost, eight prebendaries, "four boys having children's voyces" and six poor bedesmen; the duty of the latter was to say certain prayers for the founder and his family in return for the charity afforded them. The fine church built in 1545, it may be remarked, is still used as a parish church. Its spire was never completed, owing to Reformation troubles. Horrible to relate, some portions of the building were wantonly pulled down less than a century ago, and the materials sold for a few pounds to defray certain parish expenses. Other alterations have been made in the interior to suit the more severe taste of Presbyterians. "The richly carved and gilt oaken ceiling of the chancel," for instance, has been "taken down and replaced with another of lath and plaster!"[8]

The ecclesiastical foundations of the sixteenth century were not limited to Collegiate churches, for there is an instance as late as 1526 of the establishment of a Carmelite Friary in Edinburgh. The Provost and Baillies of the city granted for that purpose the lands of Greenside, at the foot of the Calton Hill, together with the chapel of the Holy Cross there. This is probably the last religious house founded in Scotland during the middle ages, and it is a significant fact that it owed its existence to the chief magistrate of the city.

No reference has been made to the foundation at Aberdeen in 1505 and St. Andrew's in 1512 of Collegiate churches in connection with the universities established in those cities; but although these can scarcely be regarded as private institutions, they are additional evidence to the prestige of the Church at that period, and to the absence of any idea of its speedy overthrow.

As to lesser benefactions, records which have escaped the almost universal wreck at the Reformation give numerous instances of the piety and charity of clergy and laity, displayed in generous gifts to the Church. The Burgesses of Newburgh, a town which owed its origin to the Benedictine Abbey of Lindores, in Fifeshire, were liberal in their donations both to the abbey and to the Chapel of St. Katharine which had been erected in their town by Abbot Cavers in 1508. Many of them burdened their properties with annual payments for the maintenance of chaplains for saying Mass. Thus James Chawmere resigned two roods of land in favor of Sir John Malcomson,[9] one of the chaplains of St. Katharine's, in 1508. Michael Anderson and John Kawe, Baillies of Newburgh, bestowed a further endowment three years later. Archibald Carno, in 1513, gave funds "for perpetual prayers for himself, his father and mother,"[10] and for the late Abbot of Lindores. In 1522 Isabella Hadingtone left a rood of land to the same chapel, and a yearly sum

[8] "New Statistical Account of Scotland," Vol. VI., p. 361 [9] It may be remarked here that the ordinary titles given to priests in the middle ages were "master," if he had taken his university degree; "sir," if he had not. [10] Laing: "Abbey of Lindores," p. 192.

to St. John's altar in the abbey. Alison Tod, in like manner, during the following year, gave land "for the weal of her own soul and the souls of her forbears,"[11] and James Tode did the same, "for the welfare of his own soul and the souls of his father and mother."[12] As late as 1542 Michael Tod, a burgess, conveyed a rood of land to the same chapel for the souls of the founders of the monastery, of the then abbot and his successors, of the donor's father and mother, ancestors and descendants and "for the souls of all the faithful defunct forever."[13]

The Carthusian monastery at Perth was enriched in the same way by the inhabitants of the city. Thus John Paull, in 1500, grants a tenement in South street to the Prior and Convent; James Drummond, burgess, assigns an annual payment of forty shillings for seven years; Robert Ramsay, another burgess, grants the Prior, in 1517, "a pound of wax yearly" out of the rent of his garden in Speygate; Sir John Lovel, a priest, grants an endowment in 1526; William Trippis, burgess, bestows on the Convent a tenement near the Turret Bridge, in 1527; Christian Cromby, wife of Andrew Bunch, resigns, in 1530, her right to certain property, in South street, in favour of the same monastery.[14]

A gift made in 1525 by Elizabeth Gray, Countess Dowager of Huntly, to the Black Friars of the same city, exhibits a special love for the offices of the Church. The Countess endows the Convent with half her lands of Littleton "for the salvation of her own soul and the soul of the late Alexander, Earl of Huntly, . . . her most beloved husband, who conferred many benefits upon her."[15] In return she binds the Friars, as she says, "to chant and celebrate solemnly, with a memorial, in their purple vestments, with deacon, sub-deacon and assisting servants, in their choir between the hours of 7 and 9 daily, one Mass of repose for the comfortable rest of my soul, and of the soul of the late Alexander, my husband."[16] The same generous lady had already contributed towards the restoration of the buildings of the convent, and required in return a special daily prayer from the Friars after their midnight office at her own tomb and that of her husband.

The Carmelites also of the same city were the recipients of numerous benefactions from the citizens. Thus Robert Esson, John Simpson and Finlay Reid, in 1500, each bestowed one of their tenements on the Friary; in 1514 John Mathison, burgess, renewed a previous annual grant of twenty shillings,[17] and in 1519 the Friars became possessed of a tenement in North street.[18]

[11] "Abbey of Lindores," p. 192. [12] Ibid, [13] Ibid, p. 196. [14] *Vide*, Lawson: "Book of Perth," p. 50-52. [15] Ibid, p. 24. [16] Ibid, p. 25. [17] In estimating the value of this and other similar donations, it must be borne in mind that taking into account the difference between Scottish and English money, it would represent about three or four times the value of money at the present day. [18] "Book of Perth," pp. 38-39.

The "Necrology" of the Friars Minor of Aberdeen recounts many instances of a like generosity. In 1520 is recorded the death of Master John Flescher, Chancellor of Aberdeen. Besides a large sum of annual revenue, he is said to have contributed twenty pounds towards the buildings. In 1552 Master Duncan Burnet, rector of Methlick, is extolled for his annual payment to the convent of ten marks, and for the gift of "a vestment of scarlet for the high altar,"[19] besides another vestment. Among other benefactors mentioned in the same record are Dame Margaret Chalmer, in 1532, Dame Jonete Patersone, relict of Sir Alexander Lauder, knight, in 1534, and Lady Egidia Blair, in 1537, all of whom contributed liberally towards the buildings.[20]

As examples of the devotion of parishioners towards their parish church may be instanced the various benefactions made during the sixteenth century to the famous Church of St. John the Baptist at Perth. Robert Clark, burgess of the city, for example, founded and endowed an altar in honor of St. Severus in 1504. Alexander Tyrie, Provost of Perth, founded the chaplaincy in honor of St. Christopher at St. Clement's altar in the church in 1511. Patrick Wallis, burgess, bestowed a tenement in 1513 on the altar of the Annunciation, previously founded by him. In 1518 Sir John Tyrie, Provost of the Collegiate Church of Methven, founded from the revenues of the Confraternity of the Name of Jesus, of which he was dean, the altar of the Holy Name, bestowing upon it a yearly revenue. In like manner the dean of the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity, Master John Ireland, founded the Trinity altar in the same year. In 1523 Finlay Anderson, burgess of Perth, founded and endowed the altar of St. Fith or Fithie the Virgin.[21] In the same year Master James Fenton, Precentor of Dunkeld, founded the altars of St. Mungo and St. Bridget, bestowing on each an annual revenue. In 1525 Sir John Tyrie founded the altar of St. Michael, and Sir Simon Young, another priest, that of St. Barbara. The latter benefactor added in 1529 another foundation—the chaplaincy of St. Gregory and St. Augustine. These and the other altars of that glorious church were continually receiving minor benefactions from the generous citizens.[22]

Sir John Tyrie, whose liberality has been more than once alluded to, was also founder in 1523 of St. Katharine's Chapel in Perth. Besides endowments for the perpetual support of a chaplain to say Mass and of "one poor man to minister in the Masses daily to be celebrated in the same chapel," there was provision for the lodging

[19] "Vestimentum de scarleto pro summo altari." "Spalding Club Miscellany," Vol. I. p. 65. [20] Ibid, pp. 68-77. [21] The writer has been unable to identify this saint. The name may possibly be a corruption of that of St. Faith, virgin and martyr. [22] "Book of Perth," pp. 66-70.

and entertainment of poor travelers. The foundation charter is worth quoting. It begins thus: "Whereas, by pious prayers and celebrations of Masses wherewith the Son is offered for sins, we believe that sins are remitted, the pains of Purgatory mitigated and the souls of the deceased frequently liberated and placed in the joys of Paradise," etc., etc.[23] This unequivocal expression of Catholic belief is a witness not only to the sound faith of the donor, but also to the general acceptance at the time of the doctrines referred to in the charter. There may, even then, have been sympathizers with Protestantism in Perth—a city which in less than forty years was to become notorious from its connection with the leaders of the Reformation—but, as a whole, it must have been still sound in the Faith to have counted amongst its citizens so many generous donors to the Church and her ministers.

The last group of benefactions which will help to serve as proof of Scotland's Catholicity just before the Reformation is that connected with the Collegiate Church of St. Giles, Edinburgh—a building destined to become later on the centre of reform. In 1502 Richard Hopper, burgess, bestows an annual rental upon the altar of Our Lady and St. Roch; Robert Vaus, three years later, makes a like donation to the high altar; Jonete Elphynston, in 1508, gives to the chaplain of the altars of All Saints, St. Thomas and St. Apollonia a portion of her lands for an annual endowment; Alexander Rynde in 1512 similarly benefits the altar of Our Saviour; Sir Alexander Lauder de Blith, Provost of the burgh, makes in 1513 a new bequest to the altar already founded by him in honor of Our Lady and St. Gabriel; while Walter Chepman bestows an annual rental, in 1513, upon the altar of St. John, whose chapel he has recently founded.

These are comparatively early bequests, but later ones are not wanting. Thus in 1523 John Patersoun, burgess, and his daughter Jonete become benefactors of St. Sebastian's altar; Sir Robert Hoppare, a priest, gives in 1527 to the altar of St. Roch some of his property; John Quhite, another priest, benefits the altar of the Holy Blood in the same year; Walter Chepman endows, in 1528, the altar of Jesus in the chapel below the cemetery; Adam Ottirburne, of Reidhall, bequeathes various rents to Our Lady's altar in 1536; John Chepman endows a chaplain for St. John's altar in the following year; while Sir Thomas Ewing, the chaplain, bestows an annual revenue upon the altar of the Holy Blood in 1542.

Lest these examples should seem to belong exclusively to the wealthier citizens, a few more must be added, at the risk of wearying the reader, to illustrate the Catholicity of another class of society.

[23] "Book of Perth" p. 80.

The trade guilds of the middle ages bore a very important part in the social and religious life of the period. They were intended for mutual encouragement and assistance in the carrying out of their respective crafts by the members of such societies, and for affording aid in poverty and sickness. Each guild had, moreover, its specified religious and charitable obligations which the members bound themselves to fulfil. The various associations of the kind in the city of Edinburgh seem to have been connected with the Church of St. Giles. Each one as it was formed claimed a special altar in that church, and the brethren became bound to provide for its decent maintenance and the support of its chaplain. The Guild of Surgeons and Barbers, who were responsible for the altar of St. Mungo, were legally bound over in 1505 to demand from each burgess an entrance fee of five pounds, to augment the necessary funds, and a weekly payment of one penny from a master or a halfpenny from a workman. The Cordwainers, who supported the altar of St. Crispin and St. Crispinian, were bound to exact from each servant his weekly halfpenny, from each master his weekly penny, to provide ornaments for the altar and "to sustain the priest's meit."[24] In 1518 the Merchants were granted the Holy Blood Aisle, "to haif the octave of Corpus Christi to be thair procuration day."[25] In 1520 the Walkers,[26] Shearers and Bonnet-makers had the altar of St. Mark allotted to them. The Candle-makers obtained in 1522 the altar of Our Lady of Pity. The Tailors received that of St. Anne in 1531.

Besides these examples of the Catholic life which was bound up with the great Edinburgh church, its records illustrate that apparent sense of the security of Catholicity to which allusion has already been made. Additions, improvements, restorations of the fabric of St. Giles' seem to have been constantly in progress up to the very epoch of the Reformation. In 1513 a new aisle was built by the Provost of the burgh, Lauder de Blith; in 1518 the Holy Blood Chapel was erected; in 1530 mention is made of a "Chalmer new biggit"[27] in connection with the churchyard; in 1543 Thomas Watson is appointed by the Provost to take charge of the windows of the "Kirk of Sanct Gele Yearlie;" in the following year the Dean of Guild is instructed to repair the "sang scule;" and "Andro Mansoun, wricht," has a pension awarded him for ten years for his work on the stalls of the choir. The most striking instance, however, is the restoration of the Lady altar, for which various benefactors provided the requisite adornments and were allowed to have their arms engraven upon their respective gifts. Among these were sev-

[24] Cameron Lees: "St. Giles, Edinburgh," p. 79. [25] Ibid, p. 80. [26] i. e., the Fullers of Cloth, *vide* Jamieson's Scottish Dictionary. [27] "A chamber new-built."

eral costly pillars of brass. The work was finished just three years before the Reformation, at which period the aforesaid pillars were carried off and made into cannon.[28]

These instances of the generosity of Catholics towards the Church and its services are merely a few culled from sources which were easy of access to the writer. They by no means exhaust the supply. They refer to benefactions from nobles, commoners, clergy and laity to a Benedictine Abbey, a Carthusian house, Dominican, Carmelite and Franciscan Friaries, a parish church and a collegiate institution situated in the widely distant regions of Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Perth and Fife, and may therefore serve as typical instances. We have every reason to suppose that the records of other religious houses, collegiate and parish churches, hospitals and nunneries would have furnished us with similar examples; it is impossible to prove the fact, for those records in most cases have perished. The hundreds of such churches and institutions scattered over the country must have been able to point to examples quite as edifying and probably even more striking than those which are here adduced.

Another fact to be borne in mind is this: Some of these gifts were made at a period posterior to the English Reformation—after Henry of England had practically made himself Pope for that country. But what is still more striking, the Lady Chapel in the Church of St. Giles was actually undergoing restoration just one year before the Earl of Argyll demolished the altars of the collegiate churches of Holy Trinity and St. Mary's in the same city in 1558. From all this it is evident that Protestantism was not unknown to these generous benefactors of the Church; yet they had no fear of its ever becoming an enemy to be dreaded. We may well suppose that in the security of their own steadfast faith they regarded the upholders of the new religion as mere raving fanatics, unworthy of consideration.

With so great a weight of presumptive evidence in favor of the thoroughly Catholic spirit of at least a considerable number of the people, and especially of the middle classes—always the staple strength of a nation—it would seem only reasonable to conclude that the Scottish people had not become in 1561 so demoralized that the "greater portion . . . had become Protestants."

It is time to turn our attention now to the other side of the question, and to examine to what extent the people of Scotland, in the early part of the Reformation movement, became attached to the religion forced upon them as a substitute for their ancient Faith. Many there were, of course, who were ready to embrace the new doctrines from conviction, led astray as they were by the vehement

[28] "St. Giles, Edinburgh," *passim*.

denunciations of Catholicity made by the reforming preachers, and possessing little solid religious instruction in the doctrines of the true Church. Others would, doubtless, be influenced by the example of the nobles and gentry who had joined themselves to the Reformers. Many more, we may well believe, would conform to escape the inconveniences of Presbyterian persecution. Yet it is evident from various proofs that the Protestant party, even after the Reformation had become a *fait accompli*, were much dissatisfied with the general result of their persistent efforts to spread the new religion. In 1581, more than twenty years after the Reformation had been effected, it was complained "that the 'dregs of idolatry' existed in sundry parts of the realm 'by using of pilgrimage to some chapels, wells, crosses . . . as also by observing of the festival days of the sancts,' " etc.[29] An Act of Parliament was therefore passed, condemning such practices and punishing them severely by fines and imprisonment. In 1583 the Assembly complained to James VI. that converts were actually being made to Catholicity: "Many," they said, "who from their youth were nourished in the Kirk of God, had become maintainers of Popery and the Man of Sin."[30] In 1586 the same body lament the fact that "Papistry abounds in the north for the want of qualified ministers."[31]

The fact was that the unhappy state of Scotland had already begun to attract zealous missionaries from the continent to sustain the faith of those who had kept staunch to Catholicity and to bring back those who had wandered away from it. The Catholic gentry kept in their houses Jesuits and other missionaries, who said Mass for the people and administered the sacraments. In some cases the ruined churches were made use of. Thus at Christmas, 1585, Mass was sung openly in the old collegiate church of Lincluden, near Dumfries, at the instigation of Lord Maxwell, and so eager were the people to take part that to escape the guards posted on the bridge to prevent them, they waded through the Nith, and wet through up to the waist, took part in the sacred offices.

The favorable disposition of a large body of the people to the Catholic religion and their hatred of the Reformed Church had attracted the serious attention of the Protestant authorities previous to the meeting of the General Assembly of the Kirk in 1588, and by means of circulars which had been addressed to the various Synods with the object of gaining accurate information on the subject, a statement was drawn up and presented to the Assembly in question. From the statistics then produced we are able to form a true estimate of the state of religion at that period—nearly thirty

[29] Chambers: "Domestic Annals of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 147. [30] "Booke of the Universal Kirk of Scotland," Part II., p. 631. [31] Ibid, p. 659.

years after the Reformation had been brought about by Parliament. The report still exists in the "Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland,"[32] the official collection of the acts of the General Assembly. A summary of it will give an unbiased picture of the power which the Catholic Church still possessed over the minds and consciences of a large section of the community in many different districts of the country.

In the neighbourhood of Dumfries "Mr. Johne Durie, Iesuite," is said to be "corrupting, seduceing and practiseing to and fro under the name of Mr. William Leing," and saying Mass in the town of Dumfries. Lord and Lady Herries, with several other persons of rank and position, are denounced by name as open followers of the Jesuit. Protestant Kirks are not properly established there, and the people refuse to hear the Word of God.[33]

In the districts of Buchan, the Garioch, Mar and Aberdeen six Jesuits are incessantly at work, corrupting the people. The Laird of Leslie has "public Mes" in his chapel where there are "two idoles above the altar." The aforesaid Jesuits assemble the Papists in Aberdeen and distribute books and *Agnus Dei* to whom they will. The destitution of the chief Kirks and the want of pastors and provision form "a special common greiffe through all the country."[34]

In Ross, where John Leslie had been made bishop, there had been "great coldness amongst all gentleman and commons since the Jesuits had liberty to pass through the country under the Earl of Huntly's lieutenantrie."[35] The Kirks are said to have been demolished and left in a ruinous state.

In Caithness the Earl of Sutherland and his lady and friends are staunch Papists, the ministers being few and destitute of provisions.

In the west of Angus are many Papists, of whom a long list is given. They are denounced as constant receivers of Iesuits and Seminary Priests. William Douglas, son of the Laird of Glenbervie, in another part of the same county, is accused of lying in wait for the ministers with a band of armed men in order to drive them from their duty.

In Fifeshire there is "superstitious keeping of Yoole (Christmas) Pasche, etc." The Earl of Huntly, to whom has been granted the abbacy of Dunfermline, brings thither "flocks of Papists, Iesuits, etc." There is no resorting to the Kirks, and in many parts these are destitute of pastors.[36]

In Lothian "sundrie Papists and Seminary Priests" have confessed that they have said Mass and preached the Faith, and when imprisoned for the same have been released without punishment—a

[32] Published by the Maitland Club (1839-45.) [33] "Universall Kirk," Part II., p. 716. [34] Ibid, p. 717. [35] Ibid, p. 718. [36] Ibid, p. 719.

striking proof of the feeling of the majority, especially of those in high places. The destitution lamented in other districts is emphasized here by the fact that Papists make use of the neglected Kirks for their own worship.

In the Merse and Teviotdale the "haill peiple are readie to revolt from the Evangell, because they see the Prince careles therof, as they say."[37] This covert rebuke to James VI. for his leanings towards episcopacy was probably inserted with the hope of rousing him to assert his staunch Protestantism in punishing offenders.

There is no minister in the town of Lanark; for no residence can be obtained for even one. In the presbytery of Stirling scarcely three Kirks have ministers. "Walter Buchanan, son of the Goodman of Auchinpryour, and a Flemis woman his wyfe" are denounced as "indurat Papists." The people are said to be given to "superstitious ceremonies, pilgrimages to Chrysts well, fasting, festives, etc."[38] In the presbytery of Dunblane the Catholic bishop, "who latelie came home," has brought with him a foreign priest, either a Frenchman or an Italian, who "draweth all with him to the old dance." The ministers are despised and the Kirks left ruined and desolate. In Glasgow "the whole ministers" are said to be "dissapointed of their livings." There are many who receive and entertain Iesuits.[39]

In the presbytery of Dumbarton the people despise the ministers, "menace them and boast in their faces." The common people have been led away by popish ceremonies. "The Ladie Marr intertaineth in the place of Arsken an excommunicated priest, Sir Andrew Nesmith." Of this priest it is related that his "messe cloathes (vestments) were once apprehended, but (he) is sincesyne of new well provided therein and in messe books (*i. e.*, missals).[40] In the district of Lennox, although there are twenty-four Kirks, there are not four ministers to serve them. In Ayr there are many Papists, and a long list of them is furnished for the information of the Assembly.

Surely, no better proof could be adduced of the loyalty of a considerable portion of the people of Scotland to their ancient Faith than this open confession of the failure of the Reformers to force upon their countrymen a newly manufactured religion. From the reports of their own agents scattered throughout the country it is manifest that the Scottish people as a body were not taking kindly to the changes which had been imposed upon them. It is striking that not even one of the districts reported upon can furnish proof of even moderate success. This is a fact worthy of notice; for the Reformers would only have been too glad to produce any evidence in their own favor. Nothing of the kind is attempted. On all sides

[37] "Universall Kirk," Part II., p. 720. [38] Ibid, p. 721. [39] Ibid, p 721. [40] Ibid, p. 722.

the same lamentation rises up. Empty and ruined churches, ministers despised by the people and in some parts contemptuously resisted and driven away, the doctrines of the Reformation openly rejected: such are the results of nearly thirty years of persistent persecution. On the other hand, Catholicity is gaining new adherents, priests are boldly ministering to their flocks, supported and defended by rich and poor alike.

This, however, is not the last confession of failure made by the reforming party. The same lamentation continually resounds in their reports of the state of religion all through the century. In 1593 the Reformers complained that "Popery" was still on the increase.[41] In the following year the Kirk was declared to be in danger on account of "the erection of the Mass in divers quarters of the land, and among others in the Earl of Huntly's houses at Straithbogie and Aberdeen, and the Earl of Errol's houses at Logyamount and Slaines."[42] In 1596 further complaints arose because "the wives of Papists" were "coming home again to Scotland."[43] Again in 1601 the Privy Council Record relates that "sundry Jesuits, seminary priests and trafficking papists, enemies to God's truth and all Christian government," were "daily creeping within the country (seeking) by their godless practices, not only to disturb the estate of the true religion, but also his hieness' awn estate, and the common quietness of the realm."[44]

One more proof of the strength of the Catholic party, whose religion had already nearly thirty years before been declared illegal, is to be found in a paper in the handwriting of Lord Burghley, drawn up for the guidance of James VI. It is still preserved in the State Paper Office. From this document we gather that in 1589 all the northern part of Scotland, including the counties of Inverness, Caithness, Sutherland, Aberdeen and Moray, together with the sheriffdoms of Buchan, Angus, Wigton and Nithsdale, were either wholly or for the greater part in the Catholic interest; Perth, Stirling, Fife, Lanark, Dumbarton and Renfrew[45] were chiefly Protestant; Ayr and Linlithgow were doubtful.[46] From this it would appear that the followers of Catholicity and Protestantism were at that time nearly equally divided.

Sufficient evidence has been adduced to show that up to the end of the sixteenth century a considerable portion of the nation, far from being attached to Protestantism, had never given up the old Faith, and that the increase in their numbers gave constant alarm to the reforming party. But it may be asked how it came to pass that

[41] "Booke of the Universall Kirk," Part III., p. 798. [42] Ibid, p. 830. [43] Ibid, p. 873. [44] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 349. [45] An exception, as will be seen later on, must be made for the city of Paisley, which was still intensely Catholic. [46] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. IV., p. 175.

the Reformation triumphed in the end. A Protestant historian shall give the answer. Mr. Andrew Lang, alluding to the ill success of the Catholic persecution of heretics under James V., gives as a reason its half-heartedness—the king himself and even some of the clergy being anxious for an excuse to avoid exacting the extreme penalty. "A cruel punishment like burning," he says, "can only be effective if practised on a very large scale, and with mechanical ruthlessness. Effective persecution, like that instituted by the Reformers as soon as the yoke was off their own necks, must work evenly, universally and, as it were, mechanically. Imprisonment, confiscation, exile, death denounced and inflicted in successive grades on all practising Catholics almost stamped out Catholicism in Scotland after 1560. Sporadic burnings and confiscations under James V. could not put down the nascent Protestantism."[47] This, then, was the secret of the eventual success of the Scottish Reformation. Persecution, ruthless and systematic, became the lot of all who, having dared to brave the prohibitions of Protestant bigotry, fell into the hands of the Reformers and their agents. History gives abundant examples, a few of which shall be here recorded.

The laws against Catholic worship were promptly acted upon. In 1562 Sir James Arthure, a priest, was apprehended for "breking of ye Quenis grace Act and ordinance, made in hir last Parliament . . . and for Baptissing of ye fassion of ye Papistry Iohne Milleris barne . . . ane barne, callit William Lichbody . . . ane barne callit William Boid," and three other "barnes" and for marrying Iohn Thomson and Margaret Whitlaw, "in ye alde and abhominabill Papist maner."[48] In May, 1563, no less than forty-eight persons were brought to trial for "attempting to restore Popery." Among them were more than thirty priests, together with Archbishop Hamilton, of St. Andrews, the Prior of Whithern, the Succentor of Glasgow and other clerics of importance. The sole charge brought against them was "the controventioune of our Soverane ladies Act and Proclamatioune" against making "ony alteratioun or innovation of the Stait of Religione;" this they had been guilty of by saying or hearing Mass and administering the sacraments in the old Catholic manner. The Archbishop and several of the priests were specially charged with hearing confessions—"in ye moneth of Apryill last by past, in ye towne of Paslay, Kirk, Kirk-yard, and Abbay Place thairof (they) openlie, publiclie, and plainly tuke auricular Confessioun of ye saidis personis."[49] The Archbishop and several of the clergy and more important layfolk were imprisoned in different towns; others, who bound themselves

[47] "History of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 431. [48] Pitcairn: "Criminal Trials," Vol. I., p. 420.* [49] Ibid, p. 429.*

not to offend again were discharged. The irony of charging the accused in the name of the Catholic queen shows the height of power to which the Reformers had attained.

Knox, in an account which he gives of the treatment dealt to a priest illustrates the spirit of bigotry which was abroad. The incident occurred in Edinburgh at Easter, 1565. "As some of the brethren," says the Reformer, "were diligent to search such things, they having with them one of the Bayliffs, took out Sir James Carvet riding hard, as he had now ended the saying of the Masse, and conveyed him, together with the Master of the house, and one or two more of the assistants, to the Tolbuith, and immediately revested him with all his Garments upon him, and so carried him to the Market-Crosse, where they set him on high, binding the Chalice in his hand, and himself fast tyed to the said Crosse, where he tarried the space of one hour; During which time, the boyes served him with his *Easter* egges."[50] On the following day the priest and his assistants were brought to court and tried and convicted of the offense against the Act of 1560. "And albeit," says Knox spitefully, "for the same offence he deserved death, yet for all punishment, he was set upon the Market-Crosse for the space of three or four hours, the hang-man standing by, and keeping him, the boyes and others were busie with egges casting."[51]

This affair may have suggested to the Regent Moray, a few years after, the commutation of the capital sentence with regard to four priests of Dunblane, condemned to be hanged at Stirling for the sole crime of saying Mass in 1569. By command of the Regent they were banished the realm after undergoing the like ignominious and disgraceful treatment. They were "bund to the mercat-croce, with thair vestmentis and challices in derisioun, quhair the people caist eggis and uther villany at their faces be the space of an hor, and thairefter thair vestmentis and challices were brunt to ashes."[52]

All the priests seized for similar offenses against the law did not escape so easily. Allusion has already been made to Archbishop Hamilton.[53] In 1573 Thomas Robison, a priest, formerly master of Paisley School, suffered death for saying Mass, having been twice previously accused of the same breach of law.[54] In the following year another, whose name is not recorded, suffered a like fate: "Upoun the fourt day of May (1574) there was ane priest hangit in Glasgow callit—for saying of Mes."[55] Other priests at about the same period escaped punishment by flight to the continent.

The unwearying zeal of the Protestant party against any person who might give the slightest cause for suspicion is illustrated in

[50] Knox: "History of Reformation," lib 5. [51] Ibid. [52] "Historie of King James the Sext," p. 66. [53] *Vide, American Catholic Quarterly*, July, 1900. [54] Buchanan: "Hist. Rerum Scotic," f. 242. [55] "Diurnal of Occurrents," p. 341.

the case of John Lowrie, a tavern keeper, accused in 1588 of treasonably maintaining, intercommuning with and supplying with meat and drink Mr. Robert Bruce, "confessit and avowed Papist and seminarie Priest, commoun enemie to Goddis truth and Cristiane government." The accused declared in defense that the person in question had merely taken food in his house and had paid for the same, he himself "nocht knawing him to be ane Priest."[56]

The laity were often made to suffer for their opinions. Thus Mr. William Murdo was accused in Aberdeen, in 1592, of being "an open railer against the ministry and truth preached."[57] He was banished from the burgh and threatened with having his cheeks branded and ears cropped should he return. One David Calderwood, of Glasgow, having in his possession a copy of Archbishop Hamilton's "Catechism," came under the notice of the Kirk authorities as a suspected Papist. Another Glasgow citizen was severely taken to task for having in the exercise of his profession as a painter depicted crucifixes in the houses of some of the citizens. Even those who merely associated with Catholics were punished. Thus, in 1595, Gabriel Mercer was accused of entertaining for three days one Elphinstone, "an excommunicated Papist," and was ordered to make a public acknowledgment of his offense from his seat in church.[58] Alexander Crighton of Perth received a similar punishment in 1610, being "convicted by his own confession of haunting and frequenting the company of Robert Crighton, excommunicate Papist, eating and drinking with him in taverns, and walking on the streets."[59] As Alexander, a month later, had not obeyed the injunction, he was ordered to be imprisoned.[60]

It might be thought that such vigilant persecution must have relaxed in course of time; such, however, was not the case. Not only in the century which saw the Reformation set up, but during the course of the two that followed, the laws against Catholics were persistently upheld, and continually enforced with more or less rigor. If at times there seemed to be a lull, some more than usually flagrant example of Papist boldness would rouse anew a tempest of bigotry. Thus in 1601 Protestant zeal was stirred afresh and many gentlemen connected with Dumfries and its neighborhood—a district always troublesome to the Kirk—were denounced for hearing Mass and entertaining priests; some were imprisoned and others who failed to answer the summons proclaimed as rebels. In 1605 Gilbert Brown, Abbot of Sweetheart, who had for many years escaped them, fell into the clutches of the Protestants, "not without peril from the country people, who rose to rescue him."[61] He was

[56] Pitcairn: "Criminal Trials," Vol. I., p. 167. [57] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 343. [58] Ibid, p. 337. [59] "Perth Kirk-Session Records," 1610. [60] Ibid. [61] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 390.

imprisoned and banished. About two years later a priest was brought from his prison in Edinburgh and subjected for ten or twelve hours to the same brutal treatment at the Market-Cross as that meted out to the Dunblane priests. His vestments and chalice were afterwards burnt, and he himself led back to prison.[62]

James VI.'s efforts to introduce bishops into the Scottish Kirk stirred up anew the persecuting spirit of the Presbyterians against Catholics. The successful capture by Archbishop Spottiswood in 1615 of the illustrious Jesuit, Father John Ogilvie, and his subsequent execution, was an opportunity to that prelate of proving that Episcopalians had no sympathy with Papists. The dauntless courage of that glorious champion of the Faith, who under the most inhuman torture refused to incriminate any of the Catholics to whom he had been ministering, and met death with positive gaiety, only tended to spread Catholicity among the laity and strengthen the resolution of the clergy.

In 1620 two other priests were apprehended, Father Patrick Anderson and Father Edmund Cana. Two years later Father Mortimer, a Jesuit, barely escaped capital punishment and was banished. In 1628 so strong had Catholicity become in the north that severe measures were taken to repress it. A long list of "excommunicated" persons was drawn up, together with an enumeration of the various priests known to be in the country, and a proclamation forbade any person to "supply or furnish meat, drink, house or harboury" to either Catholic priests or laymen.[63] Paisley, which up to Archbishop Hamilton's death had "steyked" its doors against the ministers and continued to uphold the Mass and Catholic rites generally, is described about this period as a very nest of papists.[64]

It is remarkable that James VI. was in the latter part of his reign inclined to be more lenient in his treatment of Catholics; hence at that period many priests were merely banished the realm. It is said that he would have been glad to have spared the life of Father Ogilvie had he been left to follow his own inclinations, and as a matter of fact he did not suffer another priest to be put to death. It is not unnatural to suppose that the conversion of his queen, Anne of Denmark, by Father Abercromby, about the year 1600, had something to do with this leniency. The fact of the queen's conversion is proved beyond a doubt by contemporary evidence.[65] It may be noted here that at the solemn coronation of the king and queen as sovereigns of Great Britain, in 1603, Queen Anne gave great offense to the Anglican bishops by refusing to partake of the Protestant

[62] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 390. [63] Ibid, Vol. II., p. 22. [64] Cameron-Lees: "Paisley Abbey," pp. 239-247. [65] Forbes-Leith: "Narratives of Scottish Catholics," p. 272 *et seq.*

Sacrament.[66] In the light of Catholic evidence it is easy to understand the reason of the refusal.

Under Charles I. and Charles II., the old bigotry was again stirred up at intervals. Under the Catholic King James VII. (or II.) a Catholic chapel was fitted up at Holyrood Palace, and the event caused some rioting and tumult. At his abdication a mob plundered the chapel and burned the books and furniture in the courtyard. Some of the more zealous were minded "to go to all the popish houses and destroy their monuments of idolatry, with their priests' robes, and put in prison [the priests] themselves."[67] This was accordingly done in the case of Traquair, where altars, relics, crucifixes and sacred objects generally were wantonly desecrated and destroyed; many of the articles were carried to Peebles and "solemnly burned at the cross."[68] About the same time a like scene was enacted at Dumfries with the spoils of the chapel of the Maxwell family.

When Queen Anne came to the throne, the Assembly awoke to fresh vigor; for a royal proclamation called for more strenuous efforts. A census of all the Catholics in the kingdom was taken, with the intention of putting the laws in full force. From the lists then made, and from Catholic reports to the Holy See, it appears that there were in Scotland in 1703 thirty-one priests; the laity, scattered about the south of the country, according to Protestant reports numbered about a thousand, but the Highlands are stigmatized as thoroughly "Papist." The people of almost all the Western Isles were Catholic to a man, and in the northern counties many faithful Catholics still clung to their religion and practised it publicly under the protection of the Gordons, the Huntlys and other orthodox believers. In spite of renewed search for priests and occasional banishments and confiscations, the Protestant authorities were unable to make much way against the Faith in the districts where it was most firmly established. This state of things lasted till the passing of the Catholic Relief Bill in 1793, when systematic persecution ceased.

In so slight a sketch as this many important events have necessarily been passed over—such as the brutal treatment measured out to Highland Catholics and the like; enough, however, has been said to show that the Scottish people were from the first reluctant to give up their Faith, that in spite of severe and continued persecution, a great number still clung to it, and that in certain districts—notably of the Highlands and the Hebrides—no other kind of Christianity ever gained a hearing. All honor to the heroic souls whose glory

[66] Strickland: "Queens of England," Vol, VII., p. 409. [67] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. II., p. 499. [68] Ibid, p. 500.

it was to preserve intact and hand down through many generations the Faith which had rescued their fathers from paganism, and to which they themselves clung tenaciously in face of persecution, spoliation and exile—a Faith which even death itself would have been powerless to wrench from its stronghold in their loving hearts!

Such is the story of the Scottish Reformation. It but repeats with variations the tale of the Church's overthrow in every land in which heresy has seemed to men to triumph—a tale of man's fickleness, avarice and lust of power pitted against an adversary undying and invincible. For a time the human opponent may appear victorious, but sooner or later the words of Eternal Wisdom must needs be fulfilled: "Whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder."

DOM MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

PROPOSED REFORMATION OF THE CALENDAR BY THE RUSSIAN ASTRONOMERS.

IN a late issue of the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger* we find the following:

"The revision of the Julian Calendar. (A report by Professor Glasenapp, published in the 'Novoye Vremia'.)"

The Russian Astronomical Society appointed a special commission, containing representatives of the different state departments and scientific societies, to examine into the question of the revision of the Julian calendar. This commission appointed Professor Glasenapp to make a report of the results of their conferences. The professor in his report gives the following reasons for a reformation:

First. "The Julian calendar in use in Russia is a heathen one. The light of Christianity never touched it at all."

Second. That its intercalation is incorrect to the extent of one day in 128 years.

Third. That the Gregorian calendar is also imperfect in allowing three days in 400 years for the accumulated error in the Julian, instead of three days in 384 years (3 x 128).

Fourth. That the dates of the calendar should be so changed as to have the date of the vernal equinox conform to the date on which it fell at the birth of Christ, namely, the 23d of March.

Fifth. That the names of the months should be changed because they are of pagan origin.

As the Russian Church refused to acknowledge the Pope's su-

premacy after the completion of the Greek schism, under Michael Cerularius, in the middle of the eleventh century, Russia did not fall into line like the other Christian States in adopting the Gregorian calendar; consequently their calendar (the Julian) is still in vogue in all those countries adhering to the Greek Church (Russia, Greece, Servia, Bulgaria, etc.), and their vernal equinox is thirteen days ahead of ours, 1900 being a leap year according to the Julian calendar.

Before examining the claims put forward by the Russian astronomers for a revision of the calendar it is necessary to give a brief history of this calendar with reference to chronology, showing the gross errors made by those ancient "time keepers."

The eminent astronomer, Herschell, in speaking of chronology, or the calculation of ancient observation, says that "it may be compared to that of a clock, going regularly when left to itself, but sometimes forgotten to be wound up; and when wound, sometimes set forward, sometimes backward, either to serve particular purposes and private interests, or to rectify blunders in setting."

If the Russians adopted the Gregorian calendar now, on the eve of a new century, as had been recommended in 1830 by their Academy of Sciences (it is actually in use to-day by her scientific men), all this difficulty of revision and confusion of dates could be avoided, as the Gregorian clock will be correct to a day until the year 4905—thirty centuries hence. May we not hope that long before that remote period is reached the true skin underneath the hardened Russian cuticle (alluded to by Napoleon) will become Roman, not Tartar?

The most savage and barbarous nations in the earliest periods of the world's history could not fail to see, from mere observation, that the natural units of time were the day, the month and the year. Neither could they fail to observe the regular return of the seasons, and the necessity of providing against the inclemency of winter or the burning heat of summer. This knowledge, which might be called "observational astronomy," must have compelled them, in a manner however rude, to ascertain the length of the year.

The period at which each season began was at first measured by the motions of the moon, and hence we find that all the nations of antiquity adopted a year of twelve lunations, or twelve monthly revolutions of the moon about the earth.

We find that Romulus, to whom the Roman calendar owes its origin, divided the year into ten months, the year beginning on March 1. Romulus conceived that the sun completed his course through all the seasons in 304 days, six of the months having thirty days (April, June, Sextilis, September, November, December), and

the other four thirty-one days (March, May, Quintilis, October), making in all 304 days. The year of Romulus was evidently not lunar.

This calendar of Romulus was reformed by his successor, Numa Pompilius, who at first intended to make a complete lunar year of 354 days (29½ x 12). The length of the year, according to the calculations of Numa, was fifty days longer than the year of Romulus, equal to twelve lunations of twenty-nine and one-half days each.

From each of six of the months of thirty days, according to Romulus, Numa borrowed one day each. These six days were added to the fifty already mentioned, and from these fifty-six days he composed two months—January and February—of twenty-eight days each, and transferred the beginning of the year from March 1 to January 1. He afterwards added one day to January, making the year to consist of 355 days, and adjusted, as well as he knew how, the months to the seasons. The sequence of the months as given by Numa has never been disturbed.

The calendar of Numa was a purely lunar calendar, the seasons being either disregarded or kept roughly in place by the occasional intercalation of a month or the dropping of a month. The Jews and the Mohammedans still use a lunar calendar, the Mohammedans having a year of twelve months, containing alternately 354 and 355 days. From the time of Numa no revision of the calendar was attempted for more than six centuries.

Julius Cæsar, finding that the seasons and months did not coincide as they had been adjusted by Numa, undertook to rectify the calendar. He was assisted by Socigenes, a celebrated Alexandrian mathematician. He fixed the length of the tropical year at 365 days six hours, which was ten and one-quarter days longer than the year of Numa. The seasons therefore were ten and one-quarter days ahead of the month every year, and in thirty-five years would run the round of the whole year. Julius added those ten days to the year, one each to April, June, September and November and two days each to January, August and December, and decreed that an intercalary day should be added every fourth year to the 23d of February—that is, the 24th of February (6th of the calends) should be reckoned twice, hence bissextile *(bis sexta dies)*. To the great Julius, therefore, we owe the contrivance of two years of 365 and 366 days and the insertion of one bissextile after three common years. This change took place 45 B. C., which he ordered to commence on the 1st of January, being the day of the new moon immediately following the winter solstice of the year before; and this was the first day of the first year of the Julian calendar. The 25th of December of his 45th year is the date of Christ's nativity; and the 46th year

of the Julian calendar is counted the first of the Christian era. The year preceding the birth of our Saviour is called by chronologists B. C. 1, and in historical dating of events there is no year A. D. 0.

In order to do this he enacted that the previous year, B. C. 46, should consist of 445 days, which was called the "year of confusion." The year was so thoroughly out of joint that Cicero speaks of being delayed on a journey by an equinoctial storm in October; thus showing the deplorable state into which the reckoning of time had fallen.

The Julian year, however admirably adapted to common use, was still imperfect; because the time in which the sun performs his annual revolution (from equinox to equinox) is not 365¼ days, but 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 46 seconds; the civil year therefore must have exceeded the solar by 11 minutes 14 seconds, which in the space of 128 years would amount to a whole day, and consequently in 46,720 years (365 x 128) the beginning of the year would have advanced forward through all the seasons, and in one-half that interval of time the summer solstice would have fallen in the middle of winter, and the earth would have been covered with frost when the bloom of vegetation was expected.

When the Julian calendar was introduced the equinox fell on the 25th of March, in the following year it occurred 11 minutes 14 seconds earlier, and so on. In the year A. D. 325 the Council of Nice decreed that the festival of Easter should henceforth be kept on the first Sunday after the first full moon next following the vernal equinox, which in that year fell on the 21st of March. The Council fixed that date (21 March) as the date of the vernal equinox. In the year A. D. 1582 the equinox had retrograded to the 11th of March.

Among the first to discover the imperfections of the Julian calendar was the Venerable Bede, about the year A. D. 730. He observed that the true equinox preceded the civil by about a day in 130 years. This constant anticipation of the equinox having become too considerable not to be noticed, was first formally represented to the Councils of Constance and Lateran by two Cardinals, Petrus ab Alliaco and Cusa, who showed the cause of the error and the means of correcting it.

In the year 1474 Pope Sixtus IV., being convinced of the necessity of a reformation, sent for Regiomontanus, a celebrated mathematician of that period, in order to engage him in the undertaking. The premature death of Regiomontanus prevented his assistance, and no one being thought worthy to be his successor, the project was suspended. Nearly 100 years elapsed, when Gregory XIII. had the high honor of accomplishing what several preceding Pontiffs and Councils had attempted in vain.

Pope Gregory invited to Rome a considerable number of mathematicians and astronomers for the rectification of the calendar. He employed ten years in the examination of their several formulæ, and finally gave the preference to the plan proposed by two brothers of Verona—Antonius and Aloysius Lilius. He also sent for Clavius, of the Society of Jesus, a celebrated astronomer, to supervise the work.

The first object of the reformers was to correct the errors of the Julian method of reckoning and to make the length of the year agree more exactly with the course of the sun. For this purpose it was agreed that the ten days which had been gained by the old account should be taken from October of the current year, and the vernal equinox brought back from the 11th of March to the 21st (as it had been fixed by the Council of Nice). This was done on the 4th of October, 1582, by eliminating ten days; calling the day after the 4th of October the 15th and making January 1 "New Year's Day." And as the error of the Julian intercalation was found to amount to about three days in 400 years, it was ordered that the intercalations should be omitted in all the centurial years, excepting those that are multiples of 400.

According, therefore, to the Gregorian rule of intercalation every year whose number is divisible by 4 without a remainder is a leap year, with the exception of the centurial years, which are only leap years when divisible by 400. Thus 1700, 1800, 1900 are common years, whilst 2000, 2400, 2800, etc., are leap years.

A council of the most learned prelates was convened by the Pope, and the subject having been finally settled, a brief was published in March, 1582, by which the use of the Julian calendar was abrogated and the new one substituted in its stead, called from the Pope's name the Gregorian calendar, or New Style.

Immediately after the promulgation of the new calendar nearly all of the Christian States adopted it, with the exception of the followers of the Greek Schism, and those Protestant nations who refused to be "dictated" to by Rome. England adhered to the "Old Style" until 1752, when an act of Parliament was passed adopting the new calendar. There was then a difference of eleven days between the old and new style, and so the day after the 2d of September, 1752, was called the 14th of September. The people could not understand the change, and there was considerable disturbance in London, where mobs paraded the streets shouting: "Give us back our eleven days," and complaining that their lives had been shortened by that time. The beginning of their year was changed from March 25 to January 1, to comply with the "New Style." The year 1752 was a short year of 270 days, from March 25 to December 31, less eleven days.

Notwithstanding the confusion of dates, as exemplified in this short sketch of the calendar, it is wrong to suppose that any time has been lost or gained in chronology. One cannot annihilate time. The length of the solar day and solar year has hardly undergone any change during recorded time. These may be regarded as constants. The solar year, according to astronomers, loses 6-10 of a second in a century; the earth keeping schedule time to the fraction of a second in her diurnal and annual revolution. Consequently it is only a question of mathematics to find the exact date of any well-marked phenomenon. For example, the eminent Greek astronomer, Thales, calculated, many years before its occurrence, the total solar eclipse which put an end to the battle between the Kings of Media and Lydia, B. C. 610, May 28, and the late Mr. Baily made a similar calculation of that eclipse, reckoned backwards, and found the dates to correspond.

Sir Robert Ball, late Irish Astronomer Royal (now of Cambridge University, England), is responsible for destroying our faith in the poet Wolfe's vivid picture, in the following beautiful and familiar lines, on the death of Sir John Moore:

> "We buried him darkly at dead of night,
> The sods with our bayonets turning;
> By the struggling moonbeam's misty light,
> And the lantern dimly burning."

Ball, it seems, made a calculation which resulted in the discovery that the moon on that particular hour and night could not be shining, either strongly or mistily; and was, in fact, below the horizon at the time of Sir John's hurried interment.

The vernal equinox, or First of Aries (21st March), fixed by the Council of Nice, is the point on the celestial equator crossed by the sun's pathway (the ecliptic), and is made the starting point for many celestial measurements. It is sometimes called the "Greenwich" of the celestial sphere. This point is not fixed, but moves westward on the ecliptic about 50.2 seconds every year, as if advancing to meet the sun at each annual return. Hipparchus, in the second century B. C. called this westward motion of the equinoxes "The Precession of the Equinoxes," and this vernal equinoctial point makes a complete circuit of the heavens in about 25,000 years ($\frac{360^{\circ}}{50.2}$). Now, since the tropical year is the time included between two successive passages of the vernal equinox by the sun, and since this equinoctial point moves westward 50.2 seconds every year, corresponding to about 20 minutes of time, it follows that the tropical year (the year of the seasons) is about 20 minutes shorter than a sidereal year—or the year of a complete revolution of the sun from any fixed star to the same star again.

The length of this tropical year is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds,[1] and this is the year used by all astronomers in determining the number of intercalations to be made so as to make civil time correspond to solar or tropical time. It is called the year of chronology and civil reckoning.

Let us now find the mean leangth of a Gregorian year. By the Gregorian rule there are 97 leap years in 400 years. Take for illustration the 400 years included between January 1, 1601, and January 1, 2001. In these 400 years there are 100 leap years, less the three centurial years 1700, 1800, 1900; those years not being divisible by 400 are common years. This would leave in every 400 years 97 leap years (100 minus 3) and 303 common years.

$$\left.\begin{matrix} 303 \times 365 \\ 97 \times 366 \end{matrix}\right\} = 146097 \text{ days in 400 years,}$$

Which, being divided by 400, gives the average length of a Gregorian years as 365.2425 days, equal to 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, 12 seconds. This Gregorian year exceeds the length of a tropical year by 26 seconds (365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, 12 seconds less 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds), an error which will amount to a day in 3,323 years, $(\frac{24}{26}\ ^{\text{hrs.}}_{\text{cc.}})$, so that civil reckoning will know no change until the year 4,905. (1582 plus 3323.) Up to that date the equinoxes and solstices will fall on days similarly situated; the seasons will always correspond to the same months, and the vernal equinox (used by the Church in calculating the time for the celebration of Easter) will fall for the next thirty centuries on the 21st of March, as the Council of Nice fixed it nearly sixteen centuries ago; which is surely more than sufficient for all human purposes.

Yet again, the slight error of one day in 3,323 years may be still further reduced by making the year 4000 and its multiples—8000, 12000, etc., common years; and this extension, we have no doubt, was intended by Clavius, as it agrees with his rule of 4's. By adopting the last correction the commencement of the present year would not vary a day in 100,000 years. Clavius successfully defended the plan of the Gregorian calendar against Scaliger and Vieta, the most profound scholars of their time.

In order to discover whether the coincidence of the civil and

[1] For extremely exact mathematical work, the length of the mean tropical year as given by Harkness is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46.067 seconds in terms of the mean solar day. This day is slightly variable in length, on account of the action of the tides, the slow shrinkage of the earth by loss of heat, its growth by deposit of meteoric matter and the disturbance of its form and the distribution of matter on its surfaee by earthquakes, rivers, ocean-currents, etc. Some of these causes tend to lengthen the day, and others to shorten it; an exact balance is infinitely improbable. Copernicus, the father of modern astronomy, determined the length of the tropical year to consist of 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, 6 seconds. Since his time more accurate determinations have been made, as the following, in which we give only the excess above 365 days, 5 hours. 48 minutes: Ticho Brahe (A. D. 1602), 45½ seconds; Kepler, 57.6 seconds; Flamsteed, 57.5 seconds; Halley, 54.8 seconds; Delambre, 51.6 seconds: La Place, 49.7 seconds; Bessel, 47.8; Hansen and Olufsen, 46.15 seconds; Le Verrier, 46.5 seconds.

tropical year could not be restored by a different method of intercalation, we proceed as follows:

The difference between the tropical year (365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds) and the common year (365 days) is 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds, equal to 20,926 seconds. The number of seconds in a day is 86,400. Therefore the difference between the tropical year and the common year is $=\frac{20926}{86400}$ part of a day. This fraction of a day, if reduced to a continued or chain fraction will be represented by the following approximations: $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{7}{29}$, $\frac{8}{33}$, $\frac{31}{128}$, $\frac{163}{673}$, $\frac{10463}{43200}$.

		h.	m.	s.	d.	h.	m.	s.	
(I)	$\frac{1}{4}$ of a day	=6.	0.	0	365.	6.	0.	0	=Lgth. of civil yr.
(II)	$\frac{7}{29}$ "	=5.	47.	$35\frac{5}{29}$	365.	5.	47.	$35\frac{5}{29}$	= " "
(III)	$\frac{8}{33}$ "	=5.	49.	$5\frac{5}{11}$	365.	5.	49.	$5\frac{5}{11}$	= " "
(IV)	$\frac{31}{128}$ "	=5.	48.	45	365.	5.	48.	45	= " "
(V)	$\frac{163}{673}$ "	=5.	48.	$46\frac{2}{673}$	365.	5.	48.	$46\frac{2}{673}$	= " "
(VI)	$\frac{10463}{43200}$ "	=5.	48.	46	365.	5.	48.	46	= " "

In the (I.) approximation (the Julian) the difference between the tropical year and 365 days amounts to less than one day every four years. In the (II.) to a little more than seven days in twenty-nine years. In the (III.) to a little less than eight days in thirty-three years. (It is an interesting fact that the addition of eight days every thirty-three years of 365 days each was proposed by the Persian astronomers nearly seven centuries ago.) In the (IV.) approximation to a little more than thirty-one days in 128 years, and so on; each approximation alternately greater and less, and each closer to the value of the fraction than the preceding one, until the difference between the last approximation and the length of the tropical year becomes smaller than any assignable quantity.

The (IV.) approximation of thirty-one intercalations in 128 years is evidently the one the Russian reformers have now proposed to adopt. According to the Julian calendar there are thirty-two leap years in 128 years $(\frac{128}{4})$; the Julian calendar has therefore one leap year in 128 years more than the (IV.) approximation, and agrees with the proposed Russian revision, namely: "Every year divisible by 4 is a leap year, except such years as are divisible by 128, which are normal years" (365 days). This intercalation makes the length of the Russian civil year 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 45 seconds, about one second less than the tropical year; and this difference amounts to a day in about 86,000 years; whereas, by the Gregorian rule extended, the error would not amount to a day in 100,000 years. This being the chief point of assault of the astronomical Cossacks against the entrenched Gregorian calendar, plainly shows its pitifulness, its absurdity, and that the change was conceived in a spirit of bigotry inconsistent with the erudition of its framers.

If the reformers required mathematical exactness, why not adopt the (V.) or (VI.) approximation, which will bring the civil year still nearer the length of the tropical year?

What a confusion of dates this reformation will bring. Instead of Russian dates being thirteen days behind ours, as they are now, they will be two days ahead. Christmas Day will be celebrated on the 27th of December, and so on.

And what an amount of annoyance and inconvenience to the Russians themselves this change will entail. "Letters to foreign countries, orders for shipments, times of departure of steamers and sailing vessels, news from abroad, etc., etc., must have two dates. The mariner cannot read the nautical almanac nor the merchant accept a draft from abroad, nor the broker determine foreign exchange without having two dates at hand. Advices cannot be understood, bills of lading cannot be made effective, telegrams cannot be comprehended without an extra labor, small in each instance, but large in the aggregate, which this revision will not impose." "Does he mean the Gregorian or the revised style?" is a question that will be asked in St. Petersburg and Moscow thousands of times a day.

The Russian astronomers must know (as we have shown) that their revision is an undertaking not admitting of perfection. Even at present in the Russian dominions Sunday at Moscow is Monday in Kamschatka, and the Russian children in the Klondike call it Saturday; and it is a well-known fact that when Alaska was annexed to the United States the official dates had to be changed by only eleven days, one day being provided for by the alteration from the Asiatic date to the American. At present the difference between the two calendars is thirteen days. Thus in Russia the 15th of August is reckoned the 2d, and their scientific men write it August $\frac{2}{15}$.

Another objection is that the names of the months are of pagan origin. True, but are not the names of the days of the week named after *Woden, Thor, Saturn,* etc. (Roman and Scandinavian gods)? Are not the words *earth* and *calendar* as pagan as Nero or Domitian; and are not the astronomical terms zenith, alucantar, azimuth, nadir, etc., etc., derived from the language of the congeners of the "unspeakable Turk," the polished and scholarly Moslem of Bagdad and Cordova?

Astronomy and religious knowledge from the earliest ages went hand in hand. The pagan priests of India, China, Egypt and Chaldea were the keepers of all astronomical knowledge, and used the flat roofs of their temples as observatories; and in the higher dispensation of Christian civilization we find the Church, the supreme teacher, from its first general Council of Nice, where it fixed the starting point for the celebration of Easter, down through the cen-

turies, keeping a watchful eye that month and season should not slip their moorings.

And when the vocal Memnon, awakened by the morning beams of the ever-constant sun, moans out to the gray desert, complainingly it will tell of how little man, with his petty jealousies would change the horology of time, because he failed to observe the finger of the Church, which like the gnomon on the dial keeps an unerring record.

D. O'Sullivan.

Philadelphia.

VIRGINS CONSECRATED TO GOD IN ROME DURING THE FIRST CENTURIES.

WHEN the Gospel was first announced in Rome the Empire was at the summit of its power, and its rule extended over many nationalities, of every degree of civilization and culture. As in the present day we look upon the expanding dominion of the great civilizing powers over barbarous or decayed populations in distant continents, which were unknown to Rome, as a means under Providence for bringing them to a knowledge of Christian Truth, so the destination of Rome, when it was the capital of the world, to be the seat of the earliest activities of the new teaching and the centre from which numberless influences were to radiate for its propagation, is to be regarded as a particular disposition of the same Providence. Rome at that time was rich in intelligence, practical ability, personal courage and endurance, transmitted as an inheritance down a long line of famous ancestors: politics, commerce, industry, literature and the arts drew to Rome the most enterprising and intelligent from the subject provinces. The teachings of the new faith appealed to the better instincts of man's spiritual nature, and it was fitting that they should be presented without delay to those whose higher instincts and development prepared them to accept them. Natural virtues are the substratum of the supernatural; the formation of a perfect Christian follows the bent of individual character, which is not obliterated, but purified by religion and elevated to a sphere which is not nature alone, but nature and grace. The uprightness, the fortitude, the high spirit of a Scipio, a Fabius, a Camillus or a Regulus, and the dignified grace and nobility of a Cornelia were the foundation of the virtue of a Lawrence, a Sebastian, a Cæcilia and a Marcella, examples of the highest forms of Christian heroism. It was the proud boast of the

Roman bravely to do and to bear: becoming a convert to the new faith he was not required to lower his motto.

But the Roman suffered from a great want. He had no religion, if by religion we understand a belief in the being and perfections of God, in man's obligations and responsibilities and in the practical acknowledgment of these in his conduct, regulated by a moral code furnished with sufficient sanction. The moral perceptions of the Romans could only be debased and obscured by their conception of the Divinity as represented in their mythology. Their religious and moral instruction, if we can give it the name, was chiefly influenced by schools of philosophy. Of these the Stoics, and particularly the Epicureans, were the most influential. The Stoics were pantheists, admitting no spiritual as distinguished from material substance. God and Nature they considered to be the same. Man's chief good is to live in harmony with the whole of which he is a part. The Epicureans held that happiness was the supreme good, and consisted in pleasure, the wise man taking care to seek pleasure that endures, not what is transient and may afterwards entail sorrow. The highest expression which these philosophies could give to their ethical principles was the motto, "*Sustine et abstine*," "Bear and forbear." It is apparent that no efficacious system of morality could be drawn from such abstractions. Although they exercised considerable influence on a certain class of cultivated men, they met with little sympathy in the mass of the people. The popular belief was rooted in polytheism, and no moral code by any ingenuity could ever be extracted from that. In all the fabulous hierarchy of the pagan divinities there is not one who ventures to pose as a teacher of morality, by word or example.

The absence of fixed and recognized principles of right and wrong could only have one result, a degradation of the moral sense. It would, however, be a mistake to judge of the condition of Roman society from the accounts given by ancient writers of the profligacy and licentiousness of individuals in high places. Nor are we to take too literally the highly colored pictures of the satirists, when they discourse of the follies and depravity of the women of their day. But it must be admitted that a great degeneracy of morals began to be noted soon after the first century of the Empire. The evils of a long period of peace and the great increase of wealth produced idleness and luxury and many vices in their train, which prepared the decrepitude of the State, masked for some time under a fallacious ostentation of temporal prosperity, to be rudely shattered in the first invasion of the Goths.

All through this process of decay the integrity of ancient manners was still preserved in many Roman houses. Examples of

vicious lives are on the surface of every community, and in their notoriety are perpetuated in history; while virtuous lives, passed in obscurity, are seldom recorded. When the first messengers of Christianity came to announce it in the City, they found hospitality and ready audience in this remnant of ancient Roman virtue, eager not only to accept its teachings and conform their lives to its precepts, but capable, too, of appreciating the higher perfection of the Gospel counsels, and brave enough, if the call which does not come to every one, came to them, to obey at once, and generously sacrificing ease and possessions, detach themselves from family and friends, and literally leave father and mother to follow Christ.

The Divine Founder of the Church sets before us two types of venerable womanhood: one modelled in the person of His Virgin Mother, the other in the faithful matrons who followed Him to the last. Imitators of one class and of the other have never failed in the history of the Church. In two parallel lines of uninterrupted descent we have, on one hand bands of sacred virgins, consecrating their hearts and affections and whole being to the service of God, choosing with Mary the better part, and shedding a halo of purity over each succeeding age; and on the other hand matrons like Monica, and Helen, and Clotilda, and Margaret, who in every rank of society, in the retirement and seclusion of their own homes, or amid the activity and splendor of a throne, displayed the perfection of womanhood elevated by Christian virtue. There never was a gap in the succession of the two types; and wherever the Gospel came to be preached, young maidens bore with honor the virginal wreath, and virtuous matrons spread the edification of their example in a holy widowhood. It is of the earliest manifestations of the former type, maidens consecrated to God, in the city of Rome, that we shall now treat. We shall seek these chiefly in the epitaphs, inscriptions and pictorial representations found in the catacombs, illustrated by the contemporary language of ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, and later monuments of equal authority, which bring us into the period when monastic life began to take regular organized form in the West. In prosecuting any inquiry among epigraphic and monumental remains of Christian antiquity there is only one field of research, the results of the labors of the Commendatore De Rossi for more than half a century, contained in the volumes of his "Roma Sotterranea," his "Christian Inscriptions," the "Bullettino of Christian Archæology," edited by himself unaided for more than thirty years, and his numberless dissertations published separately, or enriching the Proceedings of Learned Societies in Rome and elsewhere. The mine he explored is doubtless not exhausted, but the present generation cannot hope to see

another explorer with his talent, experience and untiring energy, assisted by an unerring instinct always pointing the way to new discoveries, a sure judgment, and a vast, universal erudition. From these sources much of the first part of the present article is substantially drawn. It is also indebted to the valuable study of this particular subject by Monsignor Wilpert,[1] a distinguished scholar of De Rossi, well known for his critical observations on the cemeterial paintings and for several independent discoveries of considerable importance.

In the very incunabula of the patristic writings, fragmentary as they mostly are, allusions are incidentally made to the class of sacred virgins set apart and watched over with special care. St. Ignatius of Antioch salutes them in his epistles to the churches of Smyrna and Philippi.[2] Pseudo-Ignatius tells Hero to guard them "as the Sacrament of Christ."[3] Later we have a succession of appropriate exhortations addressed particularly to them. Tertullian devoted two books to their instruction, one of which is now lost. St. Cyprian wrote for them *De Habitu Virginum*, St. Chrysostom an eloquent treatise. No less than five works of St. Ambrose were composed for them; and St. Jerome found time, in the busy activity of his engagements in Rome and in the engrossing study of the Holy Scriptures in Palestine, to occupy himself in their training and instruction, by word of mouth or by letter: among his Epistles nearly forty are addressed to them.

We need not, therefore, be surprised, when we examine the collections of inscriptions discovered in the subterranean cemeteries of Rome, to find epitaphs to maidens with appellations indicating that they were in a special way vowed and devoted to God. "Virgines sacræ, sanctæ, venerabiles," Sacred, holy, venerable virgins; "Virgines Dei, Christi," Virgins of God, of Christ; "Sponsæ Christi, Domini," Brides of Christ, of the Lord; "Famulæ, Ancillæ Dei, Christi," Servants, Handmaids of God, of Christ; "Templum Dei," God's Temple; "Puella Dei, Grata Deo puella, Puella Deo placita, Virgo sublimis," Maiden pleasing to God, Maiden sublime. These epitaphs all belong to the first four centuries of our era, and as is to be expected, are in perfect harmony with the expressions of veneration and esteem used by contemporary Fathers when they speak of the class of consecrated women. St. Cyprian calls them the flower of the Church's garden, the noblest portion of Christ's flock.[4] St. Athanasius calls them Brides of Christ, and the Empress Helen was proud to serve them at table with her own hands. St. Jerome in a letter to Eustochium addresses her by the style of Lady, for, he says, "that title is due to the Spouse of our Lord."[5]

[1] "Die Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Kirche." [2] "Ep. ad Smyrnaeos," xiii. Ad Philipp. v. [3] "Ad Heronen," v. [4] De habitu virginum. [5] Ep. xxii.

It can be easily understood that it was impossible for Christian maidens in time of persecution to live openly in community, under a uniform rule and wearing a distinctive habit. It was in the privacy of their own homes, in the protection of their family, that they passed their lives. Their devotion might be unknown outside this circle; they mingled in the society of their friends, preserving a modest demeanor, without betraying the secret of the King. We may still read the instructions given to them in such difficult circumstances, and the words of warning of St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose, or going farther back, the sterner reproofs of Tertullian. It sometimes happened that they were asked in marriage, and their refusal was the first clue to suspect their religion; and we have historic instances, like those of St. Agnes, St. Agatha and St. Lucy, when pagan suitors resenting their rejection, revenged themselves by denouncing them to the tribunals, which condemned them to death, doubly martyrs, "in una hostia duplex martyrium, pudoris et religionis."

The state of celibacy alone did not give the name and privileges of a sacred virgin. Tertullian distinguishes the "virgines hominum" who are free to marry, from the "virgines Dei" who resolve to consecrate themselves for ever to their heavenly Spouse. As soon as circumstances permitted, a separation into two classes was observed: those who continued to live in their own homes and those who lived in common apart. But for admission to either rank the essential condition was a voluntary act which vowed the maiden to her chosen state. Naturally this promise was contained in a formula, although not always pronounced in public, and Tertullian praises the reserve of the unostentatious virgin, whose consecration is "sibi soli et Deo nota," known to herself alone and to God."[6] There were also two forms of consecration in use, beginning from the earliest times, and continued under one name or another down to the present day: one by simple vow and change of habit, the other by the imposition of the hands of the Bishop and the veil. So early as the second century a public ceremony is mentioned by Tertullian, who with his usual rigor sees danger to the humility of the candidate in the pomp and publicity of the function, and the friendly congratulations that followed. When the act of dedication was private, the virgin was her own consecrator, but the public consecration of virgins was always reserved to the Bishop, although simple priests were allowed to consecrate widows. The solemn profession only took place on great festivals, particularly Easter, when the newly baptized were introduced to the church for the first time. A decree of Pope Gelasius (492-496) appointed the Epiphany,

[6] De virg. velandis, xv.

Easter, Pentecost and the feasts of the Apostles for the public ceremony, but permitted vows to be made at any other time in case of dangerous illness, lest those who aspired to this gift should depart without it, "ne sine hoc munere de sæculo exeant."

Before candidates were admitted to this solemn profession, they were obliged to pass a term of probation. Their dispositions were tested by the Bishop, and their acceptance depended on his decision. Previous to the fourth century no particular limit of age was prescribed. This was determined by local custom and the discretion of the Bishop. St. Basil requires the age of sixteen or seventeen. St. Ambrose, while he admits the necessity of caution, is strongly in favor of early vows in the freshness of innocent childhood, and concludes: "Nolite, ergo, a Christo arcere infantes. Vocat eos Dominus, et tu prohibes?" St. Jerome says that at the age of seven the youthful virgin should begin to learn the psalter by heart. At that age, of course, she had received only the first consecration. For the second consecration a council of Carthage prescribed the age of twenty. Other early particular councils fixed it at twenty-five, and subsequent canons raised it to forty. To trace later fluctuations would carry us beyond the period under review. Examples of consecration at ten, twelve, fourteen and sixteen years are attested by epitaphs in the catacombs. St. Agnes and St. Soteris, St. Eustochium and Demetrias were dedicated when ten years old. Even tender children were sometimes promised to God in their infancy, subject to their own ratification when they came to years of discretion. Among inscriptions to children dedicated and dying in their infancy, we have one to Severa, a child of nine, one to Olympia, "Ancilla Dei," handmaid of God, a child of five, and another to an infant three years old, a victim offered to God, "Hostia dicata Deo." Dedications at this tender age must not have been rare, for we read in the writings of several of the Fathers instructions to parents for the education of children so set apart. From a variety of provident dispositions ordained by the Church on this important subject we glean that while parental authority was respected, and its consent usually required before solemn profession, care was also taken to prevent a child being forced to embrace the state against her inclination. On the other hand, examples are not wanting of maidens, who, then as now, had to wait long to obtain the consent of their parents or guardians. We are told that they were often threatened with the loss of their inheritance, and St. Jerome, who let nothing escape him, says that in his day mothers could be found ready enough to part with ungainly daughters, but bitterly opposed to letting their better favored children enter the cloister. A touching story is related by St. Ambrose of a young lady, "once noble before the world,

now nobler before God," who was pressed by her parents and friends to marry, and was at last driven to take refuge from their importunity at the foot of the altar. "What place," says the holy Bishop, "more fit for a virgin than where the virgin sacrifice is offered? She dared yet more; for she first seized the hand of the priest and pressed it on her own head, to invoke the blessing of his prayers, then she hid her head under the sacred table anl cried: "What can protect me better than my veil, except the altar itself, which sanctifies the veil?"[7]

The veil was the chief distinction of a virgin. It was called "Velum, velamen, flammeus, mitra, mitella," and the expressions "Velare, velum accipere" described the ceremony which accompanied the act of profession. It was given to the candidate when she pronounced her vow, with the solemn words of the Bishop: "Receive, daughter, the sacred veil, and carry it without spot before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom every knee doth bow." The veil was sometimes ornamented, usually with two purple bands or links of *calliculæ*, or embroidered circles, from end to end along its length. Many representations of virgins veiled in this manner are to be seen in the catacombs, some painted on the walls, others carved on the tombstones; and frequent mention of the veil itself is made in the epitaphs. There is a very touching one on the grave of a certain Juliana, who was admitted to her vows on her death-bed:

Hanc dum corporei premerent vicinia leti,
Sponsa diu nubit sacra vela Deo.

The veil was worn by those who made their vows in private as well as by those who made them in the Bishop's hands. Both were under the same obligations, but while infraction of a simple vow was visited by severe canonical penalties, infidelity after receiving the consecration of a Bishop was punished by perpetual excommunication, only relaxed at the hour of death.

Besides the veil, which was of wool, the Christian virgin wore nothing distinctive before the middle of the fourth century. About the year 350 the ordinary dress was exchanged on profession for the sacred habit, "Habitus Deo dicatus." This consisted in a tunic or stola of coarse material unadorned, of a dark grey color, "pulla tunica," with a dusky cloak, "furvo pallio," to be thrown over it when necessary. It was the dress of the lower orders, in striking contrast with the bright garments of purple and gold worn by ladies. The habit was presented to the virgin at her consecration with these words, as we find them in St. Ambrose: "Take this garment and put on Christ; and be renewed in His understanding. Do

[7] De Virg. xi.

thou, therefore, as Christ's chosen one, put on mercy, sweetness, humility, modesty, charity, which is the bond of unity."

Beneath the veil the virgin wore her hair unshorn, "intonsos capillos." The custom of cutting off the hair was long unknown in the West, although it was occasionally practised in the spirit of penance, and was not introduced into the ceremonial of profession until long after the time of St. Jerome and the first regular monasteries of Rome. That saint tells us in one of his letters that in Syria and Egypt it was the custom for virgins at their profession to offer their tresses to be cut off by the mother of the monastery.

No ring was given to the bride at her consecration. Martène can find no ancient testimony for this rite, now inseparable in our minds from the solemn and final profession of a nun. There is no trace of it in any of the ancient sacramentaries. St. Germanus of Auxerre forbade St. Geneviève to wear any sort of ornament either hanging from the neck or on the hand. The oldest reference to such a rite is an account of the consecration of some nuns by St. Bernward of Hildesheim (ob. 1022), who placed crowns upon their heads and rings on their fingers."[8]

The consecration took place in presence of the faithful in full assembly during the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. After the Collect, or after the Lesson, the Archdeacon led the candidates to the altar and presented them to the Bishop, who addressed to them a suitable discourse.[9] After a prayer made by the Bishop, the virgin pronounced the formula of her vow, the Bishop laid his hands on her head with another prayer and placed the veil over her, the whole congregation as witnesses of the solemn act responding Amen. Mass was then resumed and the virgin received Holy Communion; at the end the Bishop consigned all who had received the veil to the care of their parents or guardians, if they were to live at home, or to the superior, the "mater monasterii," if they were to live with others in common. The Bishop accompanied this act with a solemn admonition to the guardians on the sacred charge committed to them over the newly consecrated, of whom an account would have to be rendered at the tribunal of Christ, the Judge, their Spouse.

In the cemetery of Priscilla we have a pictorial representation of the veiling of a virgin. In one of the most ancient chambers of that cemetery, which itself dates from the end of the first century, in a lunette over a tomb a venerable grey-haired man is seated on a chair of state. In front of him a youthful female figure stands erect, holding in her hand what looks like a white linen veil. Somewhat

[8] Martène, De antiq. Eccl. ritib. Vol. II., l. ii., c. vi. [9] Saint Ambrose has preserved for us the discourse delivered by Pope Liberius in St. Peter's at the midnight Mass of Christmas, when St. Marcellina received the veil. (De Virg. ad Marcellinam sororem, l. i., c. iii.)

behind, in attendance on the seated personage, a man is holding a tunic. We have here a Bishop, with his deacon, and a maiden about to receive the sacred veil. On the opposite side of the lunette the Virgin Mother is seated with the Divine Infant in her arms. Towards this group the Bishop is pointing, as if saying to the candidate: "My child, there is your model." In the centre, between the two groups, is a solitary figure of the now consecrated virgin, veiled, and vested in a gorgeous robe, the virginal tunic, richly embroidered, with hands stretched out in the attitude of prayer; a veiled nun, "Virgo velata," in the splendor of her immortal reward.

In the Ostrian cemetery there is a fresco allusive to the parable of the virgins. In the lunette of an arcosolium, divided into three compartments, we are shown in the centre an orante, the virgin occupant of the tomb; in the compartment to her left, the five wise virgins bearing lighted torches; in the compartment to her right, the five virgins seated at the marriage feast.

A more remarkable fresco introducing the same parable was discovered in 1863. Unfortunately it no longer exists. The Campo Santo or modern graveyard of Rome extends over the site of the ancient cemetery of Cyriaca, *in agro Verano*, which surrounds the extra mural basilica of St. Lawrence. During operations for enlarging the burial ground, in the hill behind the basilica, the workmen came upon many galleries and sepulchral chambers of the ancient catacomb, which were ruthlessly destroyed. Among the frescoes which perished was one that adorned the grave of a sacred virgin. In the arcosolium of the tomb our Lord was placed between two groups, on the right five virgins, on the left other five. They are ranged symmetrically in two rows on either side. All are youthful and clothed alike, in a long flowing tunic reaching to the feet, with short but ample sleeves. The virgins on our Lord's right hold torches in their right hands, the others in their left. The torches of the first group are burning and rest on their shoulders; the torches of the others are extinguished and turned towards the ground. We cannot doubt the meaning of the fresco: it is again the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, with our Lord in the midst: "Behold the Bridegroom cometh." Lower down, on the face of the wall enclosing the tomb, another scene was painted. From side to side a rod is stretched on which a curtain hangs, divided in the middle and held apart by two youths, one on each side. In the opening of the curtain a maiden is standing, robed in a rich tunic and wearing a veil. Her hands are stretched out as an orante. This was certainly the grave of a sacred virgin; the parable has already indicated it, and in this second scene the virgin is admitted into the heavenly court. In ancient records and in the Acts of the Martyrs mention

is often made of the *velum* or curtain which separated the body of the judgment hall from the inner tribunal, *secretarium*, where the judges sat. In courts there was sometimes an inner besides an outer veil, and so also in the audience chambers of princes and magistrates: it was the custom for the judge to retire within the veil to dictate the sentence. To stand within the veil was therefore to be in the immediate presence of the supreme judge, and accordingly the maiden introduced by the two youths represents a soul which has been judged, and is now by the favor of her heavenly advocates received into the dwelling and into the company of God.

The same cemetery is singularly associated with the rise of religious life in Rome. During the restoration of the neighboring basilica under Pope Pius IX. many interesting remains and fragments of important inscriptions were brought to light, and still further illustrated by the discoveries that continued to be made as the extension of the Campo Santo proceeded. About fifty epitaphs originally taken from the ancient catacomb and from the Christian cemetery which in the fourth and fifth century superseded the subterranean galleries gradually disused, were recovered. What at once struck those directing the work was the extraordinary number of epitaphs to sacred virgins found among the rest. Out of fifty inscriptions excavated five belong to that class, ten per cent. of the whole, a proportion far exceeding anything found in similar collections of epitaphs. In a situation almost identical around the basilica of St. Paul, out of a thousand epitaphs only six belonged to graves of sacred virgins, a proportion of little more than half per cent. There must have been some special reason for the interment of so many in this particular cemetery near St. Lawrence's, and the most probable explanation is that there existed in the immediate vicinity of the basilica, at the date of these inscriptions, a community of religious women, one of the "monasteria suburbana" that we read of in the correspondence of St. Jerome. The dated inscriptions found at this spot are all of the fourth and fifth centuries, a time, as we shall see later, when regular community life for women had come to be fully recognized in Rome.

The oldest of the inscriptions found in this group of Cyriaca, and bearing a consular date, is of the year 381. It is to Rufina, who lived twenty-one years. The next is to Lavinia, "Virgo Dei inimitabilis." Without date, but belonging to the same period, is an epitaph to Nigella, another to Victoria and the following, which is remarkable for its diction:

ADEODATÆ DIGNÆ ET MERITÆ VIRGINI
ET QUIESCIT HIC IN PACE JUBENTE CHRISTO EJUS.[10]

The original is in the Lateran museum. In the centre of the slab

is a *crux hastata,* a cross encircled by a wreath, supported on a fluted column, under a canopy, with the inscription carved on two small tablets right and left of the cross. It marked the grave of the virgin Adeodata, who departed this life "at the call of Christ her Spouse." In digging the foundations of the entrance to the Campo Santo an epitaph of 434 was found, and in the same place the following inscription:

QUIESCIT IN PACE PRÆTEXTATA
VIRGO SACRA DEPOSITA D. VII
ID. AUG. CONS. RUSTICI ET OLYBRI.

The consulate fixes the date in 464. The Prætextata to whom it is inscribed is mentioned in another epitaph of unknown origin, which long lay at Santa Sabina on the Aventine, and is now in the Lateran museum. She was in all probability a daughter or near relation of Prætextatus, who was Prefect of the Palace in 472. The absence of the epithet *clarissima* is no difficulty, for it was considered unbecoming to give titles of nobility on their epitaphs to those who had relinquished for God their honors and position in the world. "Neminem Christianum decet, et maxime virginem non decet claritatem ullam computare carnis et honorum." It is unbecoming for a Christian, and especially a virgin, a nun, to parade her descent and rank.[11] We know that the Prefect was a Christian and died in 472, and that a daughter of his, also a Christian, died in 486. About a hundred years before there was a Vettius Agorius Prætextatus, prominent among the last champions of expiring paganism, and a determined enemy of Pope Damasus.[12] The prestige of the pontificate was already beginning to overshadow the representatives of imperial authority in the city, and in one of his altercations with the Pope, who was pressing him to embrace the Christian faith, the Prefect exclaimed: "Make me Bishop of Rome, and I will become a Christian." Another Prætextata, a member of the same family and a contemporary of St. Damasus, wife of Festus Julius Hymetius, pro-consul in Africa, distinguished herself by her opposition to the celebrated virgin Eustochium when she wished to take the veil. To find a hundred years later a Prætextata, a sacred virgin, among the descendants of these bitter enemies of Christianity, need not surprise us; it is a proof of the sincerity of the conversions wrought in those noble houses, for nothing could be more repugnant to the traditional notions of that class than the humility and renunciation of a Christian life of sacrifice.

Another inscription from the cemetery of Cyriaca suggests a very interesting inquiry. It is in verse:

CLAUDIA NOBILIUM PROLIS GENEROSA PARENTUM
HIC JACET HINC ANIMA IN CARNE REDEUNTE RESURGET
ÆTERNIS CHRISTI MUNERE DIGNA BONIS.[13]

[10] De Rossi, Bulletino, 1863, p. 77. [11] S. Cyprian. De Habitu virg. 6. [12] S. Hieron. Contra Joan. Hierosol, 8.

The Commendatore De Rossi at once associated the Claudia of this epitaph with a vestal of the same name, who became a Christian and retired to an *asceterium* or monastery near the basilica of St. Lawrence. Prudentius alludes to her in the lines:

> Vittatus olim pontifex
> Ascitur in signum crucis,
> Ædemque, Laurenti, tuam
> Vestalis intrat Claudia.[14]

The epitaph and the verses seem to throw light on a discovery made in 1883 in the heart of the Forum. In the atrium or court of the House of the Vestals a series of pedestals may still be seen, mostly denuded of the statues which they once supported, but retaining inscriptions recording the merits and virtues of the most distinguished high-priestesses in the succession. One of these pedestals attracts attention by the evidently deliberate abrasion of the name of the dignitary to whom it had been inscribed. The epitaph reads:

> OB MERITUM CASTITATIS
> PUDICITIÆ ADQ. IN SACRIS
> RELIGIONIBUSQUE
> DOCTRINÆ MIRABILIS
> . . . . . E V.V. MAX.
> PONTIFICES VV. CC.
> PROMAG. MACRINIO
> ROSSIANO V. C. P. M.

On the base of the pedestal is the date of the dedication: V. IDUS JUNIAS DIVO JOVIANO ET VARRONIANO CONSS. That is A. D. 364. In that year therefore the College of Pontiffs dedicated a statue in honor of a priestess, whose memory for some reason came to be execrated and her name cancelled from the inscription, in conformity with the law *De memoriæ damnatione*. Quite recently a further discovery was made at a short distance from the pedestal, under the pavement of the atrium, of a buried statue evidently placed there for concealment, similar in every respect to the other statues of vestals, but decapitated, in all probability the maimed effigy of the condemned priestess. Professor Marucchi was the first to suggest the opinion, now commonly accepted, that the vestal was condemned on account of her conversion to Christianity. Whatever her offense was it must have been committed after 364, the date of the inscription which records the esteem in which she was held for her virtues and for her faithful service of the goddess. In that year Rome was on the eve of the final struggle between paganism and Christianity. As is well known, the ancient superstition and idolatrous worship did not at once cease when Constantine emancipated the Church from the penal legislation of his predecessors, and

[13] De Rossi. Inscript. II. Bullettino, 1881, p. 19. [14] Peristeph, II., vv. 525 sqq.

Rome itself became the chief centre of resistance to the encroachments of the new religion. Its numerous temples, in the magnificence of their structure, and rich abundance of memories of the glorious past connected with their history, were made to appeal to the gratitude of the Romans to keep them loyal to the gods. The last defenders of paganism strove to exalt in the popular mind its political importance and identify its preservation with the continued prosperity of the State. Among all the heathen sanctuaries of the city, no one more aptly and visibly represented this sentiment than the shrine and temple of Vesta. There, in the keeping of the six vestal virgins, themselves under the jurisdiction of the College of Pontiffs, presided over by the Pontifex Maximus, the Palladium, symbol of the safety and prosperity of the Eternal City, was guarded. This explains how it happened that the worship of Vesta was publicly maintained down to the latest years of the fourth century, and how even the title of Pontifex Maximus was retained by Constantine and his successors till Gratian indignantly refused its insignia. It may be said with perfect truth that it was only after the last spark of the sacred fire was extinguished on the altar in the Forum that paganism confessed itself overthrown.

When paganism was passing through this crisis, many of its priests made their submission to the Church, and the frequency of conversions from their ranks is evident from the lines of Prudentius quoted above. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the poet's allusion to a vestal who became an inmate of a community of Christian virgins, living in the neighborhood of St. Lawrence's basilica, should receive confirmation both from inscriptions found close to the church and from the ruins of the Vestals' court in the Roman Forum. For the defaced statue and mutilated inscription—evidence of a *memoriæ damnatio*, attaching infamy to the name of a high priestess of Vesta, in the period of religious change—and the contemporary record of the poet, all point to a conversion from paganism to the faith, as the offense visited by the execration of the vestal's name. Supposing this to have been the offense, it was natural for the Pontiffs, ardent supporters of idolatry, to mark their protest against this latest victory of the new religion in the only way now in their power; they could not punish her defection in her person, but they did all they could to obliterate her memory or render it infamous to the surviving votaries of paganism by cancelling her name from the monumental roll of Vesta's high priestesses.[15]

If the Vestal, whose memory after such high encomium on her modesty and integrity of life and religious observance of her duties in the temple of a pagan worship, was so utterly anathematized by

[15] The college of Vestals was finally abolished by Theodosius the Great, at the end of the fourth century.

the Pontiffs, is not to be identified with the Claudia celebrated by Prudentius, at all events we have the evidence of the poet that one, at least, of the Vestal Sisterhood exchanged a life of noble self-sacrifice to a false ideal for a life dedicated to the service of the Divine Spouse of virgin souls in the end of the fourth century of our era.

Our retrospect has brought us down from Apostolic times through the stormy period of persecution into the first century of the Church's freedom. Before the third decade of the era of peace had closed the institution of sacred virgins, associated together under a common roof, with a common discipline, obeying a superior, the "Mater monasterii," was already established and began to spread, not in Rome alone, but over all the provinces of the Empire. It is to be remarked, however, that the marvelous development of monastic life after the peace was not a simple outgrowth of fervor born of the happier conditions of the Church, but likewise a protest of earnest souls against threatening relaxation. For the Church issuing from persecution found herself exposed to a new danger. Paganism, practically overcome, sought to avenge itself by every means in its power. Its spirit was still strong in a variety of institutions, customs and laws. The upper classes, degenerate, selfish and servile, sought satisfaction in unbridled luxury. All this must have had a pernicious effect on Christian society, numbers were contaminated and the Church had to bewail many scandals. This deplorable condition was not that of Rome only, but of every province where the officials, civil and military, had introduced the manners and vices of the capital.

Against the deterioration that menaced the Christian community a reaction first began in the East. The great monastic creations of Egypt and Palestine opposed to the invading corruption an exhibition of self-denial and marvels of penitential austerity. The revival was taken up in Rome, and in a most unexpected quarter, the homes of the aristocracy; and the signal was given by women. Interest in the religious movement of the East was first roused by St. Athanasius, three times exiled from Alexandria and three times a fugitive in Rome. He had spent seven years in the Thebaid, where he had intimately known the great pioneers of the cenobitic life, Antony, Pachomius and Hilarion. Full of what he had witnessed in the desert, he gave glowing accounts of St. Antony, which seized the imagination of his friends and spread over the West the fame of monasticism. During one of his visits to Rome he was the guest of Albina, sister of the pagan Pontiff Albinus, but herself a Christian. She had a daughter Marcella, an ardent enthusiastic character, on whom the conversation of Athanasius made a deep impres-

sion. She wished at once to devote herself to a life after the examples he described, but having been previously engaged, out of deference to her mother, she consented to marry. In seven months she was a widow. Many suitors sought her hand, and in particular the Senator Cerealis, one of the foremost men in the State, allied to the family of Constantine; but she firmly declined every offer. She cut herself off from society and lived retired in her house on the Aventine, which she made her solitude and never left unless to visit the poor or pray in the churches, accompanied by her mother. She laid aside her jewels and accustomed dress, and was the first patrician lady to give the example of publicly wearing the despised plebeian garb of the monastic profession. For a time her singularity was decried, but soon she had a crowd of imitators. A stimulus was given to the movement by the example of Melania, another noble lady, daughter of Marcellus, Consul in 341, who losing her husband and two of her children in one year, made provision for her surviving son and started for the East. She saw St. Athanasius in Alexandria, visited many of the monasteries of Egypt, went to Palestine and built a monastery on the Mount of Olives, where with other devout companions she led a life of great austerity. Of her imitators in Rome some continued to live in their own houses, like the widows and virgins of the first centuries, others preferred companionship and began a sort of community life without as yet any fixed rule. The centre of these religious establishments, the first convents of Rome, was the house of Marcella.

The history of the primitive community on the Aventine can be clearly traced from its first inspiration in 341 for nearly seventy years to 410, when Marcella, in extreme old age, was called to her reward. That this first foundress possessed in a singular degree all the gifts that qualify for direction, St. Jerome's letters leave us in no doubt. Brilliant mental power, coupled with energy and untiring devotion, alone do not explain her success; she had from God also the grace of an irresistible attraction. Her penetration perceived the dispositions and bent of each of her children; she quickly won their confidence; her prudent counsel, now used to restrain, now to urge on, moulded them to her will, and always with the gentle persuasive hand of a mother, setting the model in the community of the Aventine of that religious family spirit which in the not distant future was to be the bond of union and the mainspring of all their power in the monastic communities that arose and spread under the legislation of St. Benedict.

The rule followed was an application of the observance in the monasteries of the Desert. The occupations of the inmates were prayer, study and labor. The foundations of the life were obedi-

ence, poverty and chastity. The order of their day may be gathered from what St. Jerome tells us in his life of St. Paula. They were called in the morning by the chant of Alleluia, and an immediate response was expected from all; the first arrivals hastening to the office which was to begin the day, waiting for the others, and modestly challenging by their example the promptness of the rest. At early morning, at tierce, at sext, at none, in the evening and in the middle of the night they sang the psalms in order. Every Sister had to know the Psalter and learn a portion of Scripture each day. Only on Sundays they went to church, and then processionally. It was close at hand, and a separate portion was reserved for their use. Each group was accompanied by its own Mother, and when they returned, in the same order, they resumed the work assigned to each. No one was allowed to have an attendant; all wore the same garb. If any one came late for the psalms or was remiss in her work she was corrected. Besides food and raiment nothing was allowed to any one. The Mother composed their little differences, imposed a rigorous fast on the unmortified, rebuked any rising vanity. Those who gave trouble with their tongue, the forward and quarrelsome she admonished once and again; the incorrigible were put last among the Sisters, made to kneel in penance at the door of the refectory and take their food alone.[16]

Among the companions of Marcella in this work was Marcellina, daughter of a former Governor of Gaul and sister of two famous brothers, Ambrose, the youthful Prefect of Liguria, chosen to be Archbishop of Milan, and Satyrus, immortalized by his brother's eloquent affection. The mother of these three children came to establish herself in Rome on the death of her husband. Marcellina, attracted to the religious life by the dominant spirit, received the veil from the hands of Pope Liberius on Christmas night in the basilica of St. Peter, in the year 352. She lived in her mother's house, and under her care the two holy brothers grew up. An ancient tradition fixes the site of the family mansion at the monastery and Church of St. Ambrose, in Massima. On the death of her mother Marcellina began to frequent the Aventine, taking part with Marcella's children in the religious exercises and studies of Holy Scripture which busily occupied them, and when St. Ambrose, in the See of Milan, became the eloquent apologist of the virginal life which his sister followed, she persuaded him to send a transcript of his discourses to Rome for the edification of her companions in religion. It is to the pious importunity of Marcellina that the Church owes the admirable treatise of the great Doctor on the high state of holy virginity. So persuasive were these discourses that the mothers of

[16] Hieron, In vita Paulæ, 19.

Milan were afraid to let their daughters assist at their delivery. Marcellina afterwards joined her brother at Milan, continuing her life of retirement and prayer under his direction, and surviving him barely a year, followed him to her reward in 398.

Another imitator of these holy examples was Asella. She was ten years old at the time of St. Athanasius' last visit to Rome, and was drawn under the spell of his influence to emulate the heroines he described. Her parents would not allow her to put on the sombre garb of her choice, but one day she contrived to sell a gold necklace which had been given her to wear, and with the price purchased a dark habit, which she put on and presented herself in the midst of her family. She was made to wait two years for her consecration. "Then," as St. Jerome tells us, "this child of twelve, nurtured in luxury and accustomed to every delicate attention, began to shut herself up in her chamber away from the eyes of all, only going out in the strictest privacy to visit the martyrs' tombs, making a desert for herself in her seclusion. Her bed was the bare ground, her days were spent in prayer, psalms and manual work. Fasting was a pleasure to her; bread and salt, with water, was all her food. She fasted all the year, at times for two or three days together, and in Lent for a week. Yet she reached the age of fifty without an ailment, sound in body and spirit, bright and joyous, grave at once and amiable, simple without affectation. Her silence was speech, her speech silence; she was always even-tempered, neat, but disdaining elegance, refined without study. Such was Asella, a pearl prized by Rome for its worth, the ornament and veneration of her sex; maidens, widows and women of the world vied with each other in their demonstrations of respect."[17]

Space will not now permit more than an allusion to the many other companions of Marcella who pass before us in the pages of St. Jerome. Most of them joined her in the freshness and innocence of youth, some after disappointment and sorrow. Lea, a noble widow, after a life of distraction, renounced the world, surrounded herself with a band of kindred souls and founded a community on the lines traced by Marcella, who took it under her care after her death and established it in one of her suburban villas converted into a monastery. Fabiola, another matron of the highest rank, to expiate a fault of inexperience, conquered the repugnance of her proud Fabian blood and humbled herself prostrate on the pavement of the Lateran basilica, in sight of the full assembly, to implore the absolution of Pope Damasus, and then withdrew to spend the rest of her days among the Sisters of the Aventine and rival with them in austerity and good works.

[17] Ep. xxiv. De laudibus Asellæ.

Highest of all in the esteem of St. Jerome were Paula and her daughter Eustochium. He can find no words to praise Paula as she deserves. Born in 347 of an ancient Christian family, she was carefully brought up under the combined influence of the old Roman spirit and the primitive Christian tradition. At fifteen years of age she was given in marriage, but her real history begins with her widowhood, in her thirtieth year. She accepted that state in its Christian sense, understood God's call and put herself in the hands of Marcella. She, stricken herself in her youth by the same calamity, found without effort words to rouse the spark of Paula's inspiration into a flame. The transformation of her life was sudden and complete. She assumed the insignia of widowhood, never more to put them aside. She prolonged her prayer far into the night; her happiness was to chant psalms with Marcella's virgins in the oratory of the Aventine. Accustomed as she had been to be borne in a litter by attendant slaves, who never allowed her feet to touch the dust of the streets, she now went out alone or in the company of a fellow-worker in charity to visit the slums of the Esquiline and the Suburra and alleviate the misery of the poor. We have learned to feel no surprise at a heroism with which the lives of the saints has familiarized us, and the daily self-sacrifice of delicately nurtured women, voluntarily devoted to the meanest offices in the various forms of religious vocation, keeps it constantly before our eyes; but it was a new and a strange example in the selfish, hard and disdainful society of aristocratic Rome.

Paula did not neglect her duties as mother of five orphan children. Marcella took into her house one of the younger daughters, Eustochium, already drawn to a life of consecration. The eldest, Blesilla, for a time gave her considerable anxiety, but her mother's prayers and patience were rewarded in the end. Her other children, a son and two daughters, she saw safely settled in life. Eustochium, sweetness and candor itself, a pearl of innocence and piety, bound to her mother by a most affectionate love, let herself be moulded by her. When Marcella received her from her mother she kept her in her own chamber, and when she was fully mature for the important step, she was presented to Pope Damasus to receive the veil at his hands. She was then about fourteeen years old. After she received the veil she was consigned again to the care of her mother. A conspiracy among her pagan relations was now formed to thwart her vocation. Under some pretext she was conducted to the house of her aunt Prætextata, heaped with attentions, supplied with slaves, fine garments and other allurements and presented to the assembled guests. Eustochium bore all without remonstrance till evening, when she quietly changed her dress, putting on again

her black habit, and went home to her mother. Although she lived outside the community, she was in daily intercourse with Marcella and assiduously followed the instructions of her children.

About this time, A. D. 382, St. Jerome arrived in Rome in the company of two Oriental Bishops, who were entertained in the house of Paula. He had heard of Marcella, but he kept aloof, and in his somewhat unsocial reserve never visited the ladies on the Aventine. There was nothing they desired so much as to benefit by the learning of the austere monk who bore the desert in his countenance and whose experience in the life they had undertaken would be so helpful for their training. It fell to Marcella to approach St. Jerome. He excused himself. Marcella redoubled her entreaties and prevailed on Pope Damasus to interpose his authority. Jerome was vanquished and agreed to begin his lectures on Holy Scripture. The joy of the community was great, and virgins who lived in their own houses in the city crowded to hear his lessons.

The instructions of the saint bore directly on the chief occupation of those lives. This work was prayer, which drew its inspiration from Scripture, as the liturgical prayer of the Church did from the beginning, uttering its canticles of joy and praise in the accents of the Holy Spirit. Such prayer, to be perfect, must be coupled with an intelligence of the words in their source, and accordingly St. Jerome exhorted his pupils to a profound study of Scripture, especially of the Psalter. He taught them not to be satisfied with a superficial glance, but critically to analyze all they read. "Intelligas Scripturæ in omnibus sacramentum: margarita quippe est sermo Dei, et exomni parte forari potest."[18] "Totum quod legimus in divinis libris nitet et fulget quidem in cortice, sed dulcius in medulla est. Qui edere vult nucleum, frangat nucem."[19] From the letters of the holy Doctor we are enabled almost to assist at these memorable lessons. He read a text, then commented on its literal sense; on that he built his interpretations; and then, putting together literal and allegorical meanings, drew his applications in unexpected and beautiful surprises. He put in evidence the parallel relation of the two Testaments, and showed how our Lord Jesus Christ was portrayed in both. From the figures he gathered practical truths and practical applications for the life of every day. His auditory was ravished. Jerome discoursed with fire; but newly arrived as he was from the East and for ten years away from his studies, he excused his uncouth accent and his rusty Latin, putting part of the blame on the troublesome Hebrew sounds over which he had labored so long. But all this rather added to the charm of the speaker, with

[18] Hieron. Ad. Eustoch [19] Id. Ep. xlix. Ad. Paulin.

his ready tempestuous eloquence and his very exterior and habit of a monk, his austere aspect worn by penance and bronzed by the sun of Asia. As the fame of these lectures came to spread abroad they were attended by many of the most distinguished priests of Rome, as Domnian and Oceanus, and even fervent laymen like Pammachius the Senator, who had been a schoolfellow of Jerome. But the lectures were addressed to Marcella's nuns, and to them his attention was devoted. Nothing is more touching than the glimpses his letters afford of the familiarity, full of confidence and respect, the pure friendship, the ardor and docility of his audience and the industry and devoted care of the austere monk to assist them in their study.

They were not content with his simple statement or to stop at his first explanations. They asked for his reasons and pressed him with new questions. St. Jerome had sometimes to confess that he was not ready with his answer, but they gave him no peace till he had satisfied them. After finding a reason he would sometimes only give half an answer to stimulate their curiosity, and let them find out the rest for themselves. A messenger would arrive at St. Jerome's lodging next morning from Marcella, bringing a fresh list of queries requiring an immediate answer. It happened more than once that the saint, busy with his revision of Holy Scripture or in his refutations of heresy or in official work for St. Damasus, could not spare a moment to reply till, finding that the messenger had been kept waiting all day, he stole an hour from his sleep and dictated his answer by the light of his lamp. At other times, after an oral explanation, they would insist on having it in writing; and more than one of the little treatises that were composed on these occasions have been preserved. These tracts were passed from one to another; St. Jerome intended them for all. One day he wrote to Marcella: "Here are two letters which I am sending to Paula and Eustochium. What I say to them is for you all." In a letter to Paula he tells her to be sure she shows it to Marcella. Marcella was indeed indefatigable in her application; she seemed never to be satisfied. Commenting one day on the psalm *Qui habitat in adjutorio Altissimi, in protectione Dei coeli commorabitur*, St. Jerome had remarked that the expression "Dei coeli," translated from the Hebrew Chaddai, was one of the ten names which God gives to Himself in Scripture. Marcella immediately asked what were those ten names and what they signified, and the saint next day sent her the explanation which we now have in treatise *De decem nominibus Dei*. Another time he was commenting a passage where there were some Hebrew words which the Seventy Interpreters had left in their original. Marcella requested an explanation. St. Jerome gave it,

but not so complete as Marcella desired. He was busy at the time over the Greek text of Aquila, and neglected the two words Ephod and Theraphim, because he did not want to be drawn into a long description of the priestly vestments. Marcella attacked him when he next came to the Aventine, and got her explanation. Still next day she wrote again to St. Jerome, sending her note by a messenger with instructions not to come back without an answer. In reply he wrote a letter beginning in a bantering way by complaining that Marcella, deep in her own studies, could not write a line to him that did not give him plenty of work and force to read once more his Bible. He then proceeds to give a complete explanation of the mysterious signification of each vestment of the High Priest.

The most ardent of his pupils, more penetrating even than Marcella, was Paula. She found in Holy Scripture all that could console, strengthen and enlighten her, and plunged into it with all her native energy. She was delighted at her own discoveries; hidden meanings came to surprise her in a passage which she had read twenty times before without discovering them. The exegesis of St. Jerome charmed her, and she pressed him more and more with her questions. "In vain," he says, "I tried to resist. I had to yield and resign myself to teach her what I had learned from the great masters of the Church. When sometimes I hesitated and professed my ignorance, that did not save me. Paula required me to say at least what other commentators thought, and tell her what interpretation satisfied me best." Comprehending that the key to the interpretation of Scripture is the language in which it is written, Paula did not shrink from the study of Hebrew. "I confess," St. Jerome says, "that the Hebrew language, which cost me so much labor in my youth and which I am still compelled to study every day not to forget what I have learned, was mastered by Paula with such success that she spoke it with purity, and could recite all the psalms in Hebrew, as did also her daughter Eustochium."

What was of chief importance to his pupils was the Psalter, those hymns into which David poured all his joys, his tears, his aspirations, his enthusiasm, and which lend themselves to express every emotion of the human heart, becoming the everlasting poetry, the eternal voice of the soul's prayer. St. Jerome made Marcella and her daughters give to them a special study, in their literal, spiritual and prophetic sense. He taught them to chant the psalms in alternate verses from opposite sides, a custom he had learned in the East. He introduced the frequent use of Alleluia, which the Roman Church reserved for Easter. In a letter to Læta, daughter-in-law of Paula, he lays down the order in which he desires the sacred books to be taken. "First let them learn well the Psalms, then draw lessons

of life from the Proverbs of Solomon. Let them learn patience from Job, then take up the Gospels, which are never to be laid aside. After these the Epistles of the Apostles, then the Prophets and historical books of the Old Testament. Last of all they may read the Canticle." The saint was most particular about the reading he allowed to the nuns. Only authors generally approved were permitted. He recommended the works of Origen, Ambrose, Athanasius, Tertullian, Cyprian and Hilary. But when Marcella wanted to read a commentary of Rheticus, Bishop of Autun, which contained some doubtful matter, for the sake of certain brilliant passages, he forbade her: "Non necesse habes aurum in luto quærere."[20]

From this remarkable programme we see that the piety which St. Jerome recommended to religious was not narrow and unintelligent, but broad and enlightened. He had no patience for the dull rusticity that in his time some mistook for holy simplicity. "Sancta rusticitas sibi soli prodest." Holy rusticity only profits itself. His mission in Rome for the three years of his stay was to make the movement begun by Marcella and her companions an engine to oppose the corruption and excess of pagan degradation and to direct and defend the chosen souls who had started in pursuit of the Christian ideal. He had all the necessary qualities for the work. Besides being a master in the Scriptures, the Doctor Maximus, he was a still greater master in the spiritual life, a director of souls. He was one of those great minds that are filled with sadness at the sight of human miseries, with disgust at everything perishable and aspirations after the infinite and eternal. The times in which he lived brought into strong relief all that can strengthen such impressions. The Roman world was perishing before his eyes, the barbarians were at the gates. "Romanus orbis ruit."[21] What he had seized with his powerful intellect was not so much the dogma and metaphysics of the Christian faith as its practical applications in the moral life. He had seen its force in the victories over sense that he admired in the solitaries of the East and that cost himself so much; and he came to Rome an impassioned propagator of the sublime virtues which are commanded to no one, but yet are the natural outcome of the highest tendencies of Christianity and the perfection of its spirit.

A movement of this kind naturally met with opposition. It came from all enemies of religious life and was not confined to the pagan faction. Its bitterest opponents were to be found in the ranks of a portion of the Roman clergy. St. Jerome had provoked their venom by his vigorous denunciations of the irregular lives of worldly

[20] Ad Furian. [21] Ad Heliodorum, xxxv.

priests and false monks who disgraced the habit they wore.[22] Those who recognized themselves in his scathing portraits turned upon him and attacked him in chorus, posing as martyrs of his defamation and heaping back on him accusations of the basest kind. They did not dare directly to attack the institution on the Aventine, they contented themselves with vilifying its director. A personality like St. Jerome's is never safe from the envy and hatred of mediocrity. If it possessed every talent of genius and every gift of holiness it would not escape the conspiracy of mean implacable rivalries. These were held somewhat in check during the pontificate of St. Damasus, a true friend of the religious movement and a staunch supporter of St. Jerome. But after his death in 384 the band of intriguers became more audacious and their slanders more odious. The saint, whose absence from his beloved solitude had only been prolonged in deference to the Pope, thought that the time was now come for him to return to the East. Still he would not leave Rome like a guilty fugitive, but as a tired victor who has earned his repose. He penned one of his masterpieces of indignant sarcasm and unmasked without pity the hypocrisy and falsehood of his detractors. This parting manifesto he embodied in a letter to Asella, one of the nuns of the Aventine, concluding with a touching farewell to his spiritual children.

A few months later Paula and Eustochium followed his example and set out for the East. On their arrival in Jerusalem they joined themselves to Melania, the pioneer pilgrim from Rome who had preceded them, and founded the monastery at Bethlehem, where St. Jerome continued the course of instruction he had begun on the Aventine. Marcella herself could never be induced to leave her charge. Paula and Eustochium pressed her with repeated invitations to abandon the "city of confusion" and seek the promised land. They put before her all the attractions of the Holy Places, and dwelt with rapture on the marvelous development of monastic life in Jerusalem, surpassing anything known in the West, and described the variety and order of the many monasteries, already peopled by monks and nuns from Gaul, and Britain, and Egypt, Macedonia and all the East, speaking different tongues, but praising God with one heart. St. Jerome, too, added his entreaties, appealing to her love for the sacred studies, which she could pursue with greater advantage in the land where the Scriptures were written and their language spoken. All these reasons failed to persuade Marcella, and she continued to govern her monastery on the Aventine till her eightieth year. Meantime all her first companions had passed away, a new generation of sacred virgins had taken their

[22] Ep. xviii.

place, emulating like the younger Paula and Principia the virtues of the novices of fifty years before; and so powerful was the effect of her holy example and direction that monasteries came to be multiplied in the city and in the suburbs to such an extent that St. Jerome himself had to confess that from the accounts he had in the East Rome had become another Jerusalem.

This was all quite true, but there was another side to the picture, known both to Jerome and Marcella. Perhaps a presentiment of coming danger, an intuition of St. John's prophetic vision of the fall of Babylon, had a part in determining Marcella not to abandon her flock. Lactantius brought down to his own day the chronicle of God's visible judgments on the persecuting Emperors,[23] and closed it with the overthrow of Maxentius and the triumph of Constantine; but it was not the guilt of rulers only that cried for vengeance. Rome itself, living throbbing Rome, whose millions had revelled in every license and made itself drunk with the blood of the saints, had filled up the measure of its iniquity. A vast number, probably the great majority, were still impenitent idolaters and hated Christianity with a deadly hatred, cursing it in their hearts as the cause of every reverse that happened to the State and ready to recommence persecution by fire and sword, if they had not been held in awe by the Christian Emperors. On these the justice of God was about to fall.

In 408 Alaric, with his Goths, appeared before the walls of Rome, which was only saved from pillage by the payment of an enormous ransom; but two years later, irritated by the bad faith of the Romans, he again laid siege to the city. Reduced by famine it could oppose no effectual resistance, and the barbarians forced an entrance on August 24, 410. They spread devastation as they advanced, marking their path by smoking ruins and heaps of slain. They plundered the palaces and heathen temples of everything valuable. It was Alaric's command to respect the churches, and this order was in part obeyed. He enforced the inviolability of asylum, particularly in the basilicas of the Apostles. It is related that in their search for treasure a sacred virgin, advanced in years, was found guarding the sacred vessels in her habitation near a church. The soldiers demanded the deposit; she refused to surrender it, and dared them to touch it. Alaric was consulted. He ordered the vessels, with their aged custodian, to be taken to St. Peter's, escorted through the tumult of the streets between a double line of guards.

Marcella had taken precautions for the security of her children. She dispersed the community, distributing them in the houses of devoted Christian families. She remained in her palace alone with

[23] De mort. Persecutorum.

Principia, the youngest, and the child of her predilection, who would not be parted from her, trusting for protection to the power of her mother's love. With blood-stained hands some soldiers invaded the house.[24] Incapable of fear, Marcella stood intrepid. They required her to deliver up her treasures. In vain she told them she had none; her gold and silver had been given to the poor, and she pointed to her coarse tunic, the sign of her poverty. In their disappointment and rage they brutally fell upon her and beat her with scourges. Mindful even then only of her charge, she cast herself on her knees at their feet, imploring them not to separate her from Principia. Her courage and her dignity overawed the barbarians, their fury gave way to respect and admiration, and, as St. Jerome says: "Compassion was found with dripping swords."[25] Marcella and Principia were honorably conducted under the protection of an armed escort to the basilica of St. Paul, where they were left in safety. Marcella did not long survive the catastrophe of Rome, and her eyes were closed by Principia.

St. Jerome received in Palestine in quick succession the news of the sack of Rome and the death of Marcella. In the desolation of so many sad memories of vanished friends and fallen greatness his grief was long too great for words. He kept silence for two years, and at length, in the inspiration of a night of watching, he gave utterance to his feelings in the magnificent eulogium of Marcella which he dedicated to Principia.[26] To her was left the continuation of the foundress's work. In Rome it suffered for a time from the effects of the invasion, the slaughter of so many patrician families and the voluntary exile of others. But the dispersion of so many who had learned the principles of religious life at the feet of Marcella, or were fired by her example, carried their knowledge and practice into distant regions in East and West. Albina and Melania the younger went to the monastery of Bethlehem, Demetrias to Africa, and the seed carried by other exiles, become missionaries of monasticism, spread it in Gaul, and Spain, and Italy, preparing the way for its further development in the fifth century, first under the rule of St. Augustine, then under the rule of St. Benedict. Everywhere the monastic movement was active after the death of Marcella, the monasteries of Rome long outlived her successor, Principia, and the spiritual race of these parents was not unworthy of its beginnings. "By the prayers and mortified lives of the nuns of Rome, Italy was saved from the sword of the Lombards."[27]

J. A. Campbell.

Rome.

[24] S. Hieron. Ep. Ad Principiam. [25] Ibid. [26] Marcellæ Epitaphium ad Principiam. [27] S. Gregorii, De Virg.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ITS RELATION TO MATERIAL PROGRESS.

A RECENT writer of considerable erudition and undoubted ability, whose writings have a wide circulation in England, and I imagine are not unknown in America, has recently published a volume[1] in which he challenges the claims of the Catholic Church on the ground that everywhere it is the enemy of material civilization and material progress. He seems to think, as we shall see presently, that he has satisfactorily disposed of its claims by showing that the Protestant countries of Europe are more progressive and more enterprising than the Catholic; that they are able to show a more brilliant array of men of genius; that they have been less troubled with revolutions; that they are more successful in colonization; more wealthy and more free; superior alike in war and in the arts of peace. The argument is not a new one, and it is one to which it is important that Catholics should have a ready answer; and it is for this reason that I propose in the present article to make one or two suggestions as to the direction in which I believe the true answer lies.

But first of all, I should like to accentuate one fact which is too often left out of sight by Catholic writers, and that is that in all things human, whether ecclesiastical or civil, there is no such thing as absolute perfection. There is always something to be said on both sides of the question. There are advantages; there are also disadvantages. The gain is not all on one side, but everywhere it is a matter of balance between gain and loss. This is the case not merely with every institution looked at in its entirety, but with almost every detail of its administration. Those of my readers who are familiar with Sir George Cornewall Lewis' "Dialogue on the Best Form of Government" will remember the perplexity into which it is liable to throw the unprejudiced enquirer who is seeking to form his judgment as to what the ideal form of constitution really is. The fact is that there is no ideal in the matter at all; it is merely a question as to the form of government, which in any given instance combines the most solid benefits to the nation with the least number of countervailing evils. It is just the same in the case of every institution connected with religion, when regarded in its concrete form as a working institution, conducted by fallible and imperfect men. Every law and enactment of the Catholic Church has its pros and cons, its drawbacks as well as its advantages. Even the code of laws which have relation to natural right and wrong have

[1] "Catholicism, Roman and Anglican." By A. M. Fairbairn, D. D., L.L. D., principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

something to be urged against them. The very worst vices have a certain attractiveness. They confer a passing and transitory benefit on those who are guilty of them, and though these benefits are infinitesimal in comparison with the after evils that they entail, yet they must exist, else there would be no such thing as temptation. And if this is the case with the vices that are condemned by the consensus of mankind, and are in direct opposition to the law of nature, how much more must it be the case where there is no immediate question of natural right and wrong at all, but only of the preponderance on one side or the other of certain indirect and perhaps rather remote consequences, some of them tending ultimately to good and others to evil? Take, for example, the question of the marriage of the clergy. The celibacy of the Catholic clergy is a purely ecclesiastical institution. It was not ordained by our Lord or His Apostles. It is not universal in the Catholic Church; the priests of the Uniate Greek Church are allowed to marry. The Pope forbade the marriage of the Latin clergy, and the Pope could, if he pleased, permit priests to marry. When we come to weigh the arguments on both sides, we shall find that there is a great deal to be said in favor of their being married. God has said that "It is not good for man to be alone." The celibate is exposed to many temptations and dangers, from which the married are comparatively free. He is exposed to the danger of selfishness and of a self-centralization which is practically impossible for one who has a wife and children to think of as well as himself. The paternal instinct which becomes strong in a man as life advances, and the natural affections, the outflow of which has a great influence in softening character, lack the opportunity of coming into full play. A celibate, living by himself, is prone to a painful sense of loneliness, especially if, as is often the case with a Catholic priest, he is stationed in some country place, where society of his equals he has none. Add to this that a clergyman's wife is often quite invaluable in her husband's parish. She is almoner, nurse, adviser and district visitor all in one, and exercises a moral influence in all the country round, to say nothing of the social and material benefits that she is able to bestow. Yet with full consciousness of all this, the Church has decreed the celibacy of her clergy, and every fair-judging man who has had a sufficient opportunity of comparing the two systems in their practical working is compelled to confess the superiority of the work done by a celibate clergy, especially in the mission field. A married clergy, taken as a body, sink to a lower spiritual level. St. Paul has settled the question, once for all. "He that is not married is solicitous for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his

wife, and he is divided." (I. Cor. vii., 32, 33.) Ask the Indian, officer or civilian, who are the most successful and devoted missioners, and he will tell you that the Protestant missioner, cumbered with wife and children, is at a very considerable disadvantage. Too often he is simply despised by the natives, as comparing unfavorably with their own celibate Buddhist priests.

In America and England the disadvantages that beset a married man who works among the poor are scarcely less marked. It is almost unreasonable to expect him to run the risk of infection and contagion, when he has to think, not of himself only, but of the peril to the lives of his wife and children, and though there are numbers of married clergymen who incur the risk in full confidence that God will keep safe the dear ones at home, yet such a course of conduct would scarcely be regarded as prudent by the generality of men. Besides this, there are other priestly duties which, if they are not absolutely incompatible with the married state, are at all events difficult for a married man to perform as he ought. For these reasons the Catholic Church, with a full cognizance of both sides of the question, has wisely decreed that there is an enormous balance of advantage in favor of a celibate clergy.

Or, to take a very different and a more fundamental question, and one that brings us directly on to the field of topics treated of by Dr. Fairbairn, the principle of authority in matters of religion is one in which there is certainly much to be said on both sides of the question; I mean, of course, by authority ecclesiastical and human authority having Divine sanction, and investing some individual man or some body of men with the right to be absolutely obeyed, not only in matters of practice, but also in regard to beliefs which are to be accepted as true. I mean that supreme authority which has a right to give a command which is binding in matters that concern human action, and the infallible authority which has a right to pronounce an infallible sentence in matters of human belief. Whether final decision rests with an individual or with some central tribunal consisting of a body of men does not matter to my present purpose. It is of the principle of authority of which I am speaking, and this principle is, and always has been, an essential element in the constitution of the Catholic Church.

Now the principle of authority and the necessity of submission to it is not an unmixed good. In matters of practice it may possibly expose the individual Catholic to the danger of having to submit to a sentence which is wrongful and unjust. For while obedience really strengthens the will, and when wisely exercised does not at all diminish, but only safeguards the initiative of the well-ordered mind, it is quite possible so unwisely to enforce obedience and to multiply

unnecessary commands as to impair that most desirable element of human character which prompts a man to elaborate for himself and to carry into execution the course of action which right reason leads him to adopt. This is especially the case when civil rulers encroach on the ecclesiastical order and exercise an all-pervading despotism. It has been said (though I should be sorry myself to endorse the saying) that if it had not been for the Catholic doctrine of submission to authority, the French people would never have tolerated the long years of "privilege," oppression and tyranny which culminated in the revolt from all authority in the French Revolution. Be this as it may, we must allow that the principle of spiritual authority, though it does not in any way hinder, yet does not of itself promote even a legitimate craving after national independence. It does not stimulate mere material progress or the desire for a wider empire or more extensive schemes of colonization. We are sometimes told that the Protestant cantons of Switzerland enjoy a greater material prosperity than the Catholic. Even if this is so, the argument would prove too much, for there is, I believe, no community in the world so materially prosperous as the Mormons of Utah. We are also told that the Northern and Protestant nations of Europe enjoy a greater degree of material prosperity than the Southern and Catholic nations. I do not believe that this is true, unless we take the words material prosperity to be identical with the accumulation of wealth. The accumulation of wealth in Protestant England is greater than that which exists in Catholic Belgium, or in the Tyrol. But if we take the expression in a wider and truer sense, and explain material prosperity as identical with material well-being, the enjoyment by the people at large of the good things of this life, the scale would certainly turn in favor of the two Catholic countries that I have just mentioned. "Godliness has promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come."

I think we may also make a further concession, and allow that the throwing off of the spiritual yoke gives a certain temporary and ephemeral stimulus to individual enterprise and to mere worldly activity. I remember many years ago asking a dear and valued friend of my youth, who had lately thrown off the yoke of religion, whether the change had not left him discontented and unsatisfied. "No," he answered; "on the contrary, I rejoice continually in my new found liberty." Now, indeed, in his old age, after many years of bitter suffering and fruitless search after his false and imaginary ideal, he sings a very different song, and confesses that he has learned to envy those who live content in the fold of the Catholic Church, but at first I am sure that he spoke truly in expressing his satisfaction at his emancipation from all control in matters of re-

ligion. And what is true of the individual is often true of the nation also, and there follow on its emancipation from the Church's yoke conquests abroad and increased wealth at home, an advance in all that seems to one who takes but a superficial view to tend to the material prosperity and even what is regarded as the "greatness" of a nation—more men of genius, more poets, more great writers, more philosophers (if we can call those philosophers who put forward false and plausible hypotheses in the place of the eternal truths of Catholic philosophy), more brilliant statesmen, more successful speculators, more gilded princes of the commercial world, more of all that dazzles the eyes of men and rouses in them a foolish and short-sighted envy. All this I would freely confess, and I see in it an exact fulfilment of the words of our Lord that "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." Yes, in their generation and not in view of any life to come; in their generation and not in the generations that shall come after them, which will sooner or later reap the bitter fruit of the showy upas tree that their forefathers have planted.

But in making this comparison between Protestant and Catholic nations three important points have to be borne in mind. The first is that whatever material prosperity and worldly advantage may accrue to a nation from the fact of its having substituted religious independence for submission to the yoke of the Church will, in the course of time, be followed by misfortune and decay. This follows from the very nature of things. The natural virtues are bound, as time goes on, to fade away if they are not supported by the supernatural. The temporary stimulus given by the abandonment of Catholicity will bring about a reaction, or perhaps will induce a prosperity which however brilliant for a time, and even apparently solid, will gradually bring about the ruin of the nation where it is found. It has for its foundation the sand, and not the rock, or if not wholly sand, yet has mingled with whatever is solid in it an element of sand that will in time cause its destruction. Look at Mahometan civilization. At first it carried all before it. It was almost everywhere victorious. It conquered Christian Spain and made inroads on the whole of Southern Europe. It was dominant for some hundreds of years, and for nearly a thousand was the formidable rival of Christian civilization. It is only since the battle of Lepanto that it has ceased to threaten the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. But after all it has proved itself utterly weak and rotten to the core. And what is true of the Moslem must in God's good time prove true of every religion that is in revolt against the religion established by Jesus Christ. In the case of Protestant countries the process of decadence is a slower one on account of the

Christianity which they still nominally retain and the Christian principles which they have inherited, in spite of themselves, from the Catholicity that they have displaced. The end must come sooner or later. The struggle may be a long one, far longer than the struggle between the early Christian Church and the power of imperial and pagan Rome. But in the end come it must, even in this world, since the nation, unlike the individual, exists only for time, and not for eternity, and therefore in time it must receive the due reward of its deeds.

The second point to be borne in mind is that all this undeniable prosperity and this brilliant material civilization which exists in nations which have shaken off the yoke of the Church is not a true prosperity or a true civilization. It is but a counterfeit, and not the genuine article. Under the surface, as we shall presently see Dr. Fairbairn himself confessing, there lurk "depravity, destitution, utter and shameless godlessness." Nowhere, save in the Christian and Catholic State, where the Church occupies her proper place, will true civilization be found.

Pope Leo XIII., in his Encyclical "Immortale Dei" (November 1, 1885) enumerates a number of the advantages that belong to States of which the organization is Catholic Christian, and to these only. He reminds us how in these alone the sanctity of family life is secured by the indissolubility of marriage and by the rights and duties of husband and wife being equitably and justly defined; how in the Christian state alone the laws are directed by the strict principles of truth and justice, and are not subject to party interests or the caprices of the fickle mob; how in it only the authority of those in power is recognized as having a sanction higher than human, and at the same time is kept within due bounds, and how party spirit is tempered by mutual charity, good will and generosity; how, in a word, "the abundant benefits with which the Christian religion, from its very nature, endows even this mortal life of man upon earth are acquired for the whole of the community and for civil society. And, finally, he quotes the challenge which St. Augustine throws down before the advocates of godless states: "Let those who say that the teaching of Christ is hurtful to the State produce armies in which the soldiers have such a spirit as Christian teaching has produced; such Governors of provinces; such husbands and wives; such parents and children; such masters and servants; such rulers; such Judges; such collectors, and such payers of the very taxes of the State as the Christian doctrine commands them to be, and then let them dare to say that such teaching is hurtful to the State; nay, rather will they not openly acknowledge that obedience to Christ is a mighty source of safety to the State."[2]

[2] St. Aug. ep. 138 ad Marcellinum 2, 1.

For we must never forget that material civilization, however brilliant, has, unless it is founded on Christian principles, a germ within it which must work by slow degrees utter moral deterioration, social degradation, and as the ultimate consequence of its internal disorders a final ruin which must, as we have said, in the end cause the destruction of its showy greatness and its imposing splendor. But here there intervenes a third principle which must not be forgotten.

Although the life of the State differs from that of the individual in that the latter is only commenced in this world and finds its consummation in the next, while the former begins and ends here below, yet the two have this in common, that even when they are both preparing themselves for final destruction, the one in the next world and the other sooner or later in this, yet God in His justice and liberality never fails to richly reward both the one and the other for whatever good is to be found intermingled with the prevailing and predominant evil. This is, of course, still more the case with nations in this life than with individuals on account of their existence being confined to this life. To quote the words of Pope Leo XIII. in another Encyclical ("Exeunte jam anno," December 30, 1888):

"The impartial and unchangeable justice of God reserves due rewards for good deeds and fitting punishment for sin. But since the life of peoples and nations does not outlast this world, these necessarily receive their retribution on this earth. Indeed, it is not a strange thing that prosperity should be the lot of a sinful nation; and this by the just designs of God, who rewards with benefits of this kind actions worthy of praise, since there is no nation altogether destitute of worth. This St. Augustine considers to have been the case with the Roman people."

Hence when we see long prosperity accompanying a rebellion from the yoke of the Church we may reasonably conclude that there still remains within it a large element of natural and perhaps also of supernatural virtue. The rebel nation may cast off the central principle of the Church, but at the same time may retain a great amount of Catholic doctrine, and even of the Catholic spirit. It is impossible to cast off all at once the traditions of a thousand years, and when a nation revolts from the Church there lingers on a great deal that is Catholic, which has become engrained in its institutions and in its laws. It of necessity retains certain virtues which were an inheritance from its Catholic days and which at the same time had the advantage of being more in accordance with the temper of the nation than the virtues which were discarded. In the northern nations the active virtues remain, the passive disappear. Justice, truthfulness, courage remain, while submission, reverence, obedience fade away. God rewards them for the former by a career of prosperity, in which

they have played an important part, even though the corruption resulting from the absence of the latter is slowly working its way. I do not hesitate to say that the absence of the passive virtues has even given a temporary stimulus to national greatness in the material order, inasmuch as the active virtues, taking to themselves a serviceable ally in the newly gained independence which was the result of rebellion, were able to act more freely, though at the same time they lost their supernatural character and their chief value in the sight of Almighty God. They became effective means of a highly developed though transitory degree of national greatness in the material order.

But if you ask me whether all this undeniable stimulus given by rebellion to worldly greatness and material prosperity in any way weakens the firmness of my adherence to the principle of ecclesiastical authority, I answer that so far from weakening it they confirm my conviction of its supernatural origin and of its being the means appointed by our Lord for the salvation of souls. If all this were not true, the contrast that our Lord draws between the kingdom of this world and the kingdom of heaven as realized on earth would have no point or significance. I find in the Catholic Church an exact realization of all that He and His Apostles laid down respecting the "kingdom of heaven" which He came to found among men. I find in her a number of characteristics fatal to immediate worldly success, all of which are predicted or foreshadowed in the New Testament. Those who live her life most perfectly are to be poor in spirit, meek, despised and hated and misunderstood by those outside the pale; they are to have a contempt and even hatred for riches and material prosperity; they are to be subject to continual persecution even from well-meaning and God-fearing men. Those who are to tread in the footsteps of the Apostles are to be men living separate from the world and at variance with her spirit, and for this reason to draw down upon themselves its contempt and dislike. At the same time there was to arise in the Church that Christ founded, in spite of its ideal and perfect beauty, an element of weakness by reason of the continual presence in its midst of those who while they were nominal members of it had nevertheless lost its spirit and taken to themselves the spirit of the world instead. As an object lesson in this respect, one of the Apostles was possessed by a spirit of criticism, by love of money and private judgment, the last mentioned leading him to what would be called in the present day honest doubts. This spirit was to spread as time went on; faith was to become feeble and charity to become cold. The net was to contain bad as well as good fish, the servants of the family were to neglect their duty and to seek their own private advantage instead

of their Master's interest. Iniquity was to abound and intellectual scepticism to go hand in hand with moral depravity. Men were to arise who were to walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, to be daring and self-willed, to despise authority and to sew the hidden seed of sects and heresies. The spirit of the world was to make its way into the Church of Christ, and the result would be that large numbers would throw off the yoke. Yet there will always be some who will remain faithful to the sweet yoke established by Christ on earth, but they would find themselves in direct antagonism with the world. On the other hand, the world would applaud those who, under pretence of asserting their rights to independence of thought and action, had emancipated themselves from the dominion of the Church. They were to be recognized by the fact that they would not accept from those whom our Lord had left to be His representatives on earth the faith as taught by them, of whom He had said: "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me." They would insist on their own interpretation and their own views of what had been laid down by Christ and His Apostles. They would boldly assert their liberty of judgment in matters of religion and would regard as a sort of slavery the submission of the intellect to the authority of the Church.

Now these men are in the very nature of things far more progressive and therefore more likely to succeed in worldly and material things than the children of the Church. The very essence of submission consists in a passive and receptive attitude to all in whom any sort of authority is recognized, whereas it is of the essence of resistance to be active. Boldness in action and a sort of audacious self-reliance is one of the qualities most valuable as means of attaining worldly success. The passive temper and the spirit of dependence, the acceptance of one's opinions ready made, instead of a gradual process carving them out for oneself, does not promote enterprise or that love of speculation which is one of the most attractive, and at the same time one of the most dangerous forms of intellectual activity. The consciousness of being liable to be checked at any moment by the voice of an authority which must be obeyed is rather discouraging to a venturesome boldness, whether in matters of theory or of practice. Hence arises that stimulus to activity of speculation, those brilliant achievements in the field of literature, that sudden development of individual as well as of national enterprise of which Dr. Fairbairn speaks in the following paragraph, and from which he draws a plausible, but at the same time an utterly fallacious argument in favor of Protestantism and of Protestant civilization:

"The centuries that have elapsed since the fifteenth ended have

been without doubt the most eventful, fruitful, momentous in the history of man, and their history has been the history of Christian peoples. The record of their material progress has been a record of marvels. America has been discovered, colonized, peopled; Asia has been opened up, almost conquered and annexed; Africa has been explored, and is being pierced and penetrated on all sides, and in the Australasian continent and islands the seeds of new States have been plentifully sown. The European States, with certain significant exceptions, are mightier than they were four centuries ago, better ordered, more moral, more populous, freer, wealthier; and the poorest of the countries has become rich and full of comforts as compared with Europe at the time of the Black Death. But what part has Christianity had in the making of modern civilization? Not much, if it and the Catholic Church be identical. The conquests and colonizations effected by Catholic States have, so far as order, progress and human well-being are concerned, been chapters of disaster and failure. The progressive peoples have been the non-Catholic. From them have proceeded the noblest of the ameliorative principles and actions of the period. They have been the least troubled with revolution; have had the most happy, well-ordered commonwealths; have enjoyed the most freedom; have most successfully labored to temper justice with mercy, to make judgment remedial, to enlarge the area of rights and to raise the ideal of duty. And the same peoples have been preëminent in the realms of thought and of spirit, been most deeply and devoutly exercised by the problems concerning man and his destiny. God has not been sparing of His gifts of great men to those who sit outside Catholicism. The Elizabethan dramatists, greatest of moderns in their own order, were the poets of the English people in the heroic moment of their reaction against Rome. Milton was the poet of a still more radical revolution. Cowper and Burns, Wordsworth and Coleridge, Tennyson and Browning, Scott and Carlyle represent the inspiration and aspiration of the same people. Herder and Lessing, Schiller and Goethe were not products of Catholicism. The most splendid cycle of thinkers since the Platonic age in Greece was that which began with Kant and ended with Hegel, sons of Protestant Germany." (Pp. 195-7.)

This is forcibly and skilfully put, and Catholics will do well to look it boldly in the face. They need not shrink before it, for it is just what will be expected by those who have penetrated to the inner spirit of the religion of Jesus Christ. It tells of earthly glories, and He said: "My kingdom is not of this world." It sings the praises of certain natural virtues, and He esteemed the most brilliant of the natural virtues as of no value whatever in comparison with the

supernatural. The beatitudes have no place in the praises of Dr. Fairbairn so long as they remain purely natural and are not raised to the supernatural order. The showy exploits that he extols may have increased the riches, the power, the comfort, the external decorum of Protestant nations, but they have gone hand in hand with the gradual waning of Faith, the corruption of social morality, and, above all, with the continuous growth of self-assertive pride and with an ever-diminishing sense of our continual dependence on God. What place is there in Dr. Fairbairn's list of the choicest virtues for those which the Apostle describes as the "fruits of the Holy Spirit," and therefore to be esteemed before and above all else? "The fruit of the Spirit," says St. Paul (and I suppose that Dr. Fairbairn would accept him as representing the mind of Christ Himself), "is love, peace, joy, benignity, long-suffering, meekness, faith, modesty, continency." (Gal. v., 23.) Are these the virtues of the conqueror and the explorer; of the man whose ambition is to bring under his country's sway large tracts of far off lands, and to spread modern civilization, with its vices as well as its virtues, among tribes that before lived in barbarism? Are these the virtues which render a nation great and glorious, as the world esteems greatness and glory? The catalogue strangely omits all mention of the active virtues dear to the heart of the ordinary Englishman of the present day. There is not a word about self-reliance, or the spirit of enterprise, or a desire of renown, or of patriotism, magnanimity (μεγαλοψυχια.) Why are these latter ignored? Simply because, in spite of their intrinsic excellence, they are primarily natural, not supernatural, virtues. They are virtues which are to be found in a high degree in those who have flung off the yoke of Christianity altogether. They are virtues, many of them most beautiful virtues, but they are not distinctively Christian virtues. Some of them are liable, if they are exclusively cultivated, to overshadow and obscure the beauty of the supernatural virtues, and even to thrust them aside altogether. They are, moreover, liable to degenerate into vices where the Christian spirit of submission and humility is absent. They lead to the spread of a civilization which is not a distinctly Christian civilization. Those who glory in them above all others are prone to share the old Roman tactics which adapted the civilization they introduced to whatever religion was prevalent in the country annexed or subdued. What has been the policy of Protestant England in India, in Egypt, in Africa itself? It has been everywhere to introduce civilization without Christianity. I know that I am liable to the retort that if this is so it amounts to a condemnation of the Christian virtues. So it does, if a passing worldly greatness and worldly success is the chief end of life for the individual or the nation. The retort is a per-

fectly successful refutation of my argument in the mouth of the Agnostic or Deist. But in the mouth of a Christian it is a virtual denial of the fundamental principles of Christianity. It proclaims in contradiction to the words of Christ Himself that His kingdom is of the world. It declares the temporal to be of more value than the eternal. It sacrifices the kingdom of heaven to worldly dominion. It is true that men who profess to be followers of Jesus Christ do not assert this in so many words. But the fact that they urge the various successes of non-Catholic nations in the temporal order as an argument against Catholic Christianity proves that they regard worldly prosperity and greatness as valuable in itself, whereas Christianity proclaims that it, like all else, is valuable only in so far as it spreads the kingdom of Christ on earth and opens the door of heaven to those who otherwise would still sit in darkness and in the shadow of death. And this, I maintain, modern conquest and modern civilization does not do. Perhaps I shall be told that modern conquest opens the door to the Christian missionary. This is perfectly true, but it is due partly to the spirit of toleration, not to say indifference, which is of the essence of Protestant civilization, partly to the sense of justice which is, thank God, a characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race, and to its appreciation of the self-denying charity of the Catholic missioner. But at the same time I cannot help thinking that the most brilliant triumphs of the Cross have been for the most part separate from and independent of conquests by the State. The Christianity of England was not introduced by the Roman conqueror, and though Roman missionaries carried the Gospel into all parts of the earth, and thus made Roman sovereignty indirectly help on the spread of Christianity, yet Roman prefects and Roman governors were the bitterest enemies of the faith in almost every country in Europe. The State may civilize, and a Christian State may, but very seldom does, smooth the way for the preachers of the Gospel. But it is the missioner who, carrying his life in his hand, enters on the field of his labors alone and with no human power to back him, who has been the most effective agent in evangelizing the dark places of the earth and of spreading the only Christian civilization that deserves the name.

But if the modern spirit and the Protestant form of Christianity that has been dominant in America and England and Germany during the last three hundred years has been powerless to bring under the dominion of Christ the foreign lands that have come under the sway of Protestant countries, much more has it been a complete failure in really doing the work of Christ at home. When Dr. Fairbairn says in the passage I have quoted above that the modern Protestant States are "more well-ordered, freer, more populous, more

moral, more full of comforts than they were four centuries ago," I am willing to concede the material and social improvements of which he speaks; but he must be strangely ignorant of the true state of the masses in Protestant countries if he asserts for them a higher morality and a more Christian spirit than that which prevails in countries which have remained faithful to the See of Rome. Take any country town (to say nothing of the modern Babylon) in England or Protestant America and compare it with one of the same size in Catholic Ireland, or Belgium, or Westphalia, or the Tyrol. In the one you will find good order, I allow, great external respectability, at least in the upper and middle classes. But beneath the surface you will find a seething mass of destitution and pauperism, of degradation and godlessness among the old and of corruption and immorality, especially among the young; an utter godlessness; an almost entire absence of all the virtues that are distinctively Christian, no faith, scarcely any realization of the world unseen, a sad neglect of prayer, very little humility, very little purity, a state of things heathen rather than Christian; the world and worldly success and worldly riches and worldly comforts the end and object of human life; paganism instead of Christianity. Indeed, Dr. Fairbairn himself confesses this to be the case in the early pages of his book. After speaking of the various benevolent agencies at work in England, he continues:

"Grant the facts and the inference to be alike true, ought they to satisfy the Christian conscience, or ought not that conscience—in the face of the destitution, depravity, utter and shameless godlessness which exist in spite of all the expenditure and efforts of the churches—to be filled with deep dissatisfaction? For what do these evils mean? That our society is to the degree that they exist not only imperfectly Christian, but really un-Christian." (P. 5.)

Now what will you find in a similar town—say in Ireland? You will find a firm faith, a solid piety, a purity which seems almost incredible to those who are only acquainted with corrupt England. You will find prayers said regularly every night and morning, regular and devout frequentation of the sacraments, almost every inhabitant of the town present at Mass every Sunday morning. You will find a sweet simplicity and innocence among the young, an honesty and uprightness, based on supernatural motives and on a heartfelt loyalty to their religion, that can scarcely be overstated. "Why, I could leave my portmanteau in the middle of the street, and no one would touch it," was the testimony of an English officer who had been stationed in a town in the west of Ireland to the honesty of its inhabitants. Froude also has a testimony like this. [See Young's "Protestant and Catholic Countries Compared."] A still more satis-

factory witness to the morality of the people was that of a priest who had just been giving a mission in some Irish country town, who assured me that a large majority of those who lived there never committed a mortal sin from one year's end to another. I do not say that the same high standard prevails everywhere, even in Ireland, but I am quite certain, both from my own experience of the country and the testimony of others, that the standard of piety, obedience to the laws of God and of the Church, of honesty, mutual charity and, above all, of purity, is a thousand times higher in Catholic Ireland than in Protestant England.

I daresay that Dr. Fairbairn would not find much to admire in such simple and honest Catholics. He would pronounce them ignorant, unprogressive, priest-ridden, uncivilized. But he would nevertheless find them modeled after the likeness of Christ, full of love to Christ and very dear to His Sacred Heart, and an utter contrast to the godless and too often degraded inhabitants of the towns and villages of Protestant England.

There is another charge brought by Dr. Fairbairn against the Catholic Church which at first sight seems rather remote from the one that I have been challenging, but which is really very closely connected with it. He is not able to find in the religion of the New Testament any trace either of "sacerdotalism" or of "politico-monarchical organization." If this were true, it would follow as a matter of course that the Catholic organization which has inaugurated the Catholic State would be a departure from the intention of Christ, and that it would be necessary to organize society on some such natural principles as are the basis of the civilization of distinctively Protestant countries, without any formal unity, without any corporate existence, without any sort of hierarchy on the part of the religion which is to be the recognized creed of the citizens. Dr. Fairbairn says, and says with perfect truth, that all development in religion must be a gradual development from an original "germ," but that there must be found from the very beginning an unmistakable trace of the existence of this germ, else the development will be a corruption, and not a true development. Now his position is that in the religion of Christ and His Apostles, as laid down in Holy Scripture, we find no trace either of sacerdotalism or of any sort of "politico-monarchical organization." But I had better quote his own words:

"Measured by the standard of a sacerdotal religion, Jesus was not a pious person; He spoke no word, did no act that implied a priesthood for His people. He enforced no sacerdotal observance, instituted no sacerdotal order, promulgated no sacerdotal law; but simply required that His people should be perfect as their Father in

heaven was perfect. . . . But Catholicism is here the precise opposite of this aboriginal religion, this Christianity of Christ and His Apostles. The priesthood is essential to it; without the priesthood it could have no existence, no Saviour present in its services, no Mass, no sacraments, no confessional; in a word, no worship for God, no comfort or command for man." (Pp. 168, 170.)

And again:

"There is no evidence that Jesus ever created, or thought of creating, an organized society. There is no idea He so little emphasizes as the idea of the Church. The use of the term is attributed to Him but twice—once it occurs in the local or congregational sense, and once in the universal, but only to define His own sole activity and supremacy; His familiar idea is the kingdom of God or of heaven; but this kingdom is without organization and incapable of being organized. Indeed, though the ideas may here and there coincide, it is essentially the contrary and contrast of what is now understood as the Catholic Church, whether Roman or Anglican. Further, in the Church of the New Testament the politico-monarchical idea does not exist; there is no shadow or anticipation or prophecy of it. The Churches are not organized, do not constitute a formal unity, have a fraternal, but no corporate relation; have no common or even local hierarchy; they are divided by differences that preclude the very idea of an official or infallible head. Supremacy belongs to no man; there is no bishop in the modern sense, over any church, or over the whole Church; no recognition of Rome as the seat of authority, the only holy or preëminent city being Jerusalem. The question as to Peter is very significant. He may be the rock on which the Church is to be built; the promises made to him may be taken in the highest possible sense; but what then? There is no evidence that what was promised to him was assured to his successors, no evidence that he had any successors, least of all that his successors, if he had any, were the Bishops of Rome, or that Rome in any way entered into the thought of Jesus." (Pp. 176-7.)

All this is good, straightforward argument, and would be a very telling argument if only its premises were founded on fact. But the complete ignoring of facts which underlies Dr. Fairbairn's various contentions is really scarcely credible. We will begin with the extraordinary assertion that our Lord never thought of creating an organized society. Why, the very idea of a society without organism is a contradiction in terms. It would be about as reasonable to talk of a living body that had no organism. Organism is just as necessary to life in the social as in the material order. We suppose that Dr. Fairbairn belongs to some religious body, and we should like to ask him whether it does not possess some kind of organism.

It must have certain conditions of membership and some form of government. It must contain those who teach and those who are taught, those who hold some sort of office and those who are simply members of it, and nothing more. Without this it would be no society at all, or else a mere home of anarchy and disorder. Moreover our Lord constantly applies to the society He founded the name of kingdom, and a kingdom implies not merely a King, who rules it, but Ministers and officials who carry out the King's commands and have a delegated authority from Him. It implies a corporate and duly organized society. Beside this, He calls it "the kingdom of heaven," which implies that the society He founded on earth is the earthly counterpart of the kingdom over which He rules in heaven. Now the kingdom of heaven is essentially an organized society. It contains all the Nine Choirs of Angels enumerated in Holy Scripture. It contains archangels as well as angels. It contains Princes, who rule over countries and kingdoms (Dan. x., 14), as well as the ministering spirits to whose guardianship are committed individual men. Dr. Fairbairn's ideal, whether on earth or in heaven, seems to be one of chaos instead of order. But our Lord employs other metaphors to describe His kingdom on earth, which imply that it is to be a corporate, external organized body. It is to be a household, a city, a family, a flock. It is to contain stewards, rulers, servants. It is to contain the evil as well as the good. And as soon as our Lord had ascended into heaven the work of organization commenced under the Apostles. They, if any, must have known their Master's mind. Deacons are appointed to work under the Apostles as sub-officials of the Church. The Apostles assemble in Jerusalem and lay down certain rules for the conduct of those who are received into the Church. St. Paul bears witness that Christ appointed Apostles, evangelists, prophets, pastors and doctors for the work of the ministry. He himself passes a judicial sentence on the incestuous Corinthian and orders the local assembly of the faithful to carry out the sentence. Bishops are appointed to rule the Church of God, and are to reprove, rebuke, exhort. They are to reject heretics (Tit. iii., 10) and to hold to the form of sound words committed to them. (II. Tim. i., 12.) All this implies organization, an organization, it is true, which is in its infancy, but yet sufficient to show that from the first the Catholic Church was an organized body, and that its Founder intended it to be such.

The mistake which Dr. Fairbairn makes is that he overlooks in the Church as it appears in the writings of the Apostles the undeveloped embryo which contains in germinal condition the elements of its subsequent organization. He is not satisfied because he does not find in the early stages of its growth all the fully developed char-

acteristics of its maturity. He forgets that the Church, though in one sense Divine, inasmuch as it had a Divine Founder, was nevertheless a human institution, which according to the ordinary course of the Providence of God was to grow with a human growth and with the aid of its human environment. Our Lord Himself points this out in the parable of the corn: "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Dr. Fairbairn expects to find in the ear all that is found in the ripened corn. It is true that our Lord entrusted to His Apostles a complete body of Christian doctrine. But a complete body of Christian doctrine is something very different from a completely organized Christian society. The Christian doctrine was entrusted to a select few. It took years and even centuries before it permeated the mass of the faithful. Some portions of it lay dormant for hundreds of years after the death of those to whom it was originally entrusted. Even the central doctrine of Peter's supremacy, though from the very first it was an essential element of Christian teaching, was at the beginning an implicit rather than an explicit part of the Faith as preached by St. Paul, St. James, St. John the Divine and the other Apostles. The personal infallibility which was bestowed on each and all of our Lord's Apostles rendered the prerogatives of Peter less immediately indispensable than they afterwards became; and the exercise of his supremacy was practically almost in abeyance as long as the Christian communities were only in their infancy, founded by those who had their commission directly from Jesus Christ Himself, and as long as persecution made it necessary for the leaders of the Church, and above all for St. Peter himself, to live in disguise and concealment hidden away from those who were determined to root out the very name of Christian from the face of the earth. Dr. Fairbairn wants the Christian Church to spring into being at once as a perfectly organized body; he wants it to have a regular system of government exercised in its full perfection when it was struggling into being in the face of the most determined and relentless opposition; he does not recognize the fact that God makes use of human agencies and human methods in carrying out his supernatural designs. The Church worked into its system elements which already existed ready-made in previously existing systems. She inherited from the Jewish system what we may call the priestly idea; from the imperial system of Rome she adopted the title and to some extent the idea of the Pope as Pontifex Maximus, the High Priest, as well as the supreme ruler of the Church. For though in the Christian Church as established by Jesus Christ there was contained from the first the Pope with all his prerogatives as the Vicar of Christ, yet the temporal and spiritual powers which were united in the Roman Emperors facilitated and

paved the way for the position that was gradually developed and finally recognized as the fulfilment of the idea that was sketched by our Lord Himself, but only came into its complete realization when under Constantine the Church became free and the Pope was able to take his proper place as the inheritor of all the spiritual and some of the temporal prerogatives of the Emperor. Dr. Fairbairn seems to think that this fact is fatal to the claims of the Catholic Church. "The Catholic Church," he says (p. 183), "owes its distinctive organization to Roman Imperialism," and he thence concludes that it is in this respect human and transitory, not Divine and eternal. He gives the history of the genesis of the Catholic system in a paragraph which is very much to the point:

"The principle of development, analytically applied to the Catholic system, proves that the parent form or aboriginal germ—the ideal and society of Jesus—was by its environments modified in a two-fold direction. First, from the ancient religions, Jewish and pagan, it received the notion of the priesthood, with all its accessories, and so became sacerdotal. And secondly, from the Roman empire, working on the material of its primitive Judæo-Hellenic policy, it received the dream and function of Roman supremacy, and so became Catholic, Papal and infallible." (P. 189.)

This paragraph, though it contains an element of truth, makes the fundamental mistake of supposing that what Dr. Fairbairn calls imperialism and sacerdotalism were introduced into the religion of Jesus Christ as something which was not found in the primitive germ; that is to say, in the religion as founded by Christ Himself. To imagine this to be possible is almost an insult to the wisdom and foresight of the Divine Founder of the Catholic Church. It supposes Him to have started an institution which was destined to be perverted and disfigured from the very first. We do not know whether Dr. Fairbairn would venture to assert that the realization of Christ's ideal was to be held in abeyance until He should proclaim to the world what it really was, and should correct the mistaken view that has prevailed among all the saints and doctors of the Catholic Church during the last 1,900 years. If this is so, we can only say that he is a very presumptuous, as well as a very misguided man. At the same time it is perfectly true that Christianity assimilated to itself the previously existing ideas of a priesthood and a monarchy from the systems that preceded and accompanied it. But it assimilated them because they were already in it, at least in embryo, and in something more than embryo. The theory of the Church, or, to speak more correctly, the law that was to be gradually developed in the Church's system, was laid down by our Lord Himself. When He said to His Apostles: "As My Father hath sent me, even so I

send you; he that hears you hears me," He decreed that sacerdotalism (in its true sense, not in Dr. Fairbairn's sense) should be the law of the Church that He came to found, that those whom He appointed His delegates and representatives should inherit His sacerdotal powers as the great High Priest after the order of Melchisedech; when He entrusted to them the consecration of the Blessed Eucharist, as He had consecrated it, and the forgiveness of sins, which God alone can forgive, He explicitly committed to them the two most important functions of the sacerdotal office and of its supernatural power. So again when He declared Peter to be the foundation on which the Church was built; when He gave to him the keys which designate the ruling power in house or city or castle; when He gave to him individually the command to feed His flock, He made him sole monarch of the Church in His place. And not Peter only, but his successors also, for how was the house to endure unless its foundation should endure also? How was the flock to be fed unless the first shepherd was to have a line of successors who should in their turn rule the Church of God?

I have said that Dr. Fairbairn's idea of sacerdotalism is an incorrect one. No one could have penned the following passage who had any real acquaintance with the practical relations of the Catholic priest to the faithful in general:

"The greater the emphasis laid on the priesthood and mediation, with their associated ideas and instruments, the less general became His (God's) influence and the less immediate intercourse with Him; and as He lost, the intermediaries gained in reality to faith. The very notion of religion was revolutionized, ceased to have the spiritual immediacy, the ethical breadth and intensity, the filial love and peace, the human purity and gentleness of Jesus; and became more akin to the ancient sacerdotal and ceremonial worships. The great enemy of God is the idea of the Church and its priesthood. Nothing has so estranged men from Him as the claim to be alone able to reconcile Him and them." (P. 203.)

This passage, which, as every Catholic knows, is absolutely at variance with fact, can only be excused (if this can be called an excuse) by Dr. Fairbairn's complete ignorance of the matter about which he writes. He develops it out of his own consciousness, out of what he imagines to be the case, not what is the case. It is the old, and I must say, the stupid Protestant argument: "It must be so, therefore it is so." In the first place, it is false that the priest claims to be alone able to reconcile God and man. On the contrary, he declares that any sinner who makes a genuine act of contrition and of love of God, will be at once reconciled to God without the intervention of any priest or other human intermediary. In the

second place, to say that the priesthood destroyed the spiritual immediacy of religion, which I suppose means that it interferes with the immediate intercourse between God and man (the soul), is about as true as to say that the postman destroys the moral immediacy of our correspondence with our friends and interferes with our free intercourse with them. So far is there from being any strength in this monstrous statement that the very reverse of it is true. The one aim and object with which the priesthood exists is to bring the individual soul into a closer and more immediate personal relation to God, to bring man nearer to God, to establish a more intimate friendship between the soul and God, to break down the obstacles that separate them. And as to what he says about religion ceasing by reason of the priesthood to have the ethical breadth and intensity, the filial love and peace, the human purity and gentleness of Jesus, I do not think that there is anything that needs to be said about it except that it is a perfectly arbitrary and empty statement that has no foundation whatever in fact.

Last of all, to say that the idea of the Church and its priesthood is the great enemy of God is in such open contradiction with the oft repeated words of Holy Scripture that we wonder that even Dr. Fairbairn does not see that he is strangely misled by his own wild theories. What can be clearer in the New Testament than the intensity of the love that Christ bears for His immaculate spouse, the Church? What can be more plainly set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews than the doctrine of the Christian priesthood and the Christian altar? And if there is a continuous tradition handed down from earliest days, it is that of the Christian Church, the Christian priesthood and the Christian altar.

One other remark occurs to me regarding Dr. Fairbairn's book. In his case, as in the case of almost all the assailants of the Church, the real cause of their dislike to the Catholic Church, and to what he calls sacerdotalism, is a very imperfect belief, if there is any belief at all, that Jesus Christ, who died on the altar of Calvary, is really consubstantial and co-equal with the Father. With such a belief the following passage seems to me quite inconsistent:

"The affirmation of a new religious ideal was of the essence of Christ's life. Of this ideal the prophets had dreamed, but He made it an articulate reality. God was to Him what He had never yet been to man—a living Father, loving, loved, in whom He was enbosomed, through whom and to whom He lived. He knew no moment without His presence; suffered no grief that the Father did not share, tasted no joy He did not send, spoke no word that was not of Him, did no act that was not obedience to His will. Where the relation was so immediately filial and beautiful the mediation of

a priest would have been an impertinence, the use of his sacrifices and forms an estrangement—the coming of a cold dark cloud between the radiant soul of the Son and the gracious face of the Father. . . . What God is among His worlds Jesus was among men. He is the mind and heart of God personalized for humanity; His universal ideal realized." (Pp. 26-8.)

Again:

"To Christian men Christ is the normal and normative religious person, *i. e.*, the person whose living is their law, who made the standard to which they ought to conform and who distributes the influences creative of conformity. Now in Him religion was a perfect relation to God expressed in speech and action creative of a perfect humanity, a humanity made through knowledge of God obedient to Him. As embodied in Him, religion was in the presence of sin and sorrow a holy passion, a suffering unto sacrifice due to a love that identified the sinless seeker with the sinner that He sought." (P. 32.)

Now these passages seem to me to have a distinctly Arian ring about them, and I cannot conceive it possible that they should have been written by one who truly realized and believed in the Godhead of Jesus Christ. From such a faulty conception of the central doctrine of Christianity a faulty conception of the Church He founded and of all that pertains to her is a necessary consequence. This is the true source of all Dr. Fairbairn's vagaries, and there is no hope of his understanding the true character of the Church that Jesus Christ founded on earth until he attains to a true conception of its Divine Founder.

R. F. Clarke, S. J.

Oxford, England.

Scientific Chronicle.

MALARIA AND THE MOSQUITO.

Many theories have been advanced to explain the spread of malaria. One theory held it was a specific poison generated in the soil, and search has been made to discover this poison in the gases generated in swamps or in the vegetable organisms of malarial districts, but without success. The sudden and excessive abstraction of heat from the body under the influence of cold and damp has also been advanced as an explanation. Now, however, the prevalent opinion among scientific men is that malaria is contracted only through inoculation by the mosquito. To prove practically the truth of this theory, Drs. Sambon and Low will live until October in the most malarious part of the Roman Campagna. The observers and their servants will live in a mosquito-proof hut. During the day they are free to go where they wish and they intend to mix freely with the inhabitants. From an hour before sunset to an hour after sunrise they must remain in the hut. The rays of the sun are carefully excluded from the building, which is practically an air tank, designed to collect the cool damp air from the marsh. They will sleep in this atmosphere, but they will be protected from the mosquito, for the parts of the building not made of tongued and grooved boards are carefully protected by walls of very fine wire gauze, through which the mosquitoes cannot pass. The physicians do not intend to take quinine or any other precaution against malaria except avoiding being inoculated by the mosquito. They hope thus to show practically that the latter is the true method by which malaria is propagated.

While it is true that the mosquito exists in malarial regions, it is not yet established that the mosquito acquires the parasite from any other source than from men who, while suffering from malaria, visit these regions. The malaria spreader is not the ordinary or *culex*, but the *anopheles* mosquito. The *culex*, while much more abundant, do not seem capable of transmitting the malaria germ. An interesting description of these two genera is given by Mr. L. O. Howard, Ph. D., in the *Scientific American* for July 7, 1900, from which we select the following points of comparison between the two:

In the adult *anopheles* the palpi are nearly as long as the sucking beak, but in the *culex* they are very short. The *anopheles* has as a rule spotted wings, the *culex* has not. The males of both genera are readily distinguished from the females by the fact that the antennæ and palpi are feathery. The resting position seems to af-

ford a means of distinguishing the two genera. The *anopheles* holds its body nearly at right angles to the surface upon which it rests, while the *culex* keeps the body parallel with the surface. The hum of the female is also different in the two genera. In the *culex* the note is higher than in the *anopheles*. The eggs of the *culex* are placed endwise on the surface of the water and joined together in a raft-like mass. The eggs of the *anopheles* are loosely placed sidewise on the surface and are not joined together. The eggs hatch in from three to four days in May.

The larvæ of the two genera also differ. That of the *culex* comes to the surface every minute or two to breathe and descends to the bottom to feed. It has to make an effort to rise. The larva of the *anopheles*, on the contrary, until full grown habitually remains on the surface of the water. Its breathing tube is much shorter and is held parallel to and just below the surface film of water. It works the mouth constantly and directs small solid particles floating on the water to the alimentary canal. The pupa of both genera do not differ so widely.

The activity of the larva and pupa of mosquitoes preserves them from the predatory animal life of the stagnant pools in which they live. The life of an *anopheles* is thus summed up from the account of Mr. Howard: Egg stage, three days; larval stage, sixteen days; pupal stage, five days. The adult stage cannot be definitely stated, beyond the fact that in the latitude of Washington they hibernate from November to April.

It has been stated that in Italy alone two million people have malaria every year, and that of that number fifteen thousand die. The extent of the injurous effects of malaria on the human body renders any attempt at solving the mystery of its origin most valuable.

THE PARIS TELESCOPE.

The large telescope of the Paris Exhibition is without doubt one of the greatest attractions in that world of wonders. Sir Norman Lockyer in *Nature* for December 21 last gives a detailed description of this wonderful instrument. At first it was thought possible to construct the telescope on the reflecting principle with a reflector ten feet in diameter. This had to be abandoned when it was found that the glass manufacturers could not furnish the glass for such a reflector. The telescope is therefore a refracting telescope with object glasses 1.25 meters in diameter.

The instrument is mounted in front of a siderostat which has a mirror two meters in diameter. This method of mounting secures

greater stability, avoids the expense of a dome and renders the observer's work less fatiguing. The chief feature of this method of mounting is, of course, the siderostat. This apparatus, according to the description of Mr. Lockyer, "comprises a pedestal of cast iron, the north part of which supports the polar axis and the south part the mirror with its frame. The cast iron pedestal, eight meters long by eight meters high, is furnished with six screws which fit in sockets fixed to the stone base 1.70 meters high. The north part of the pedestal supports the polar axis with its divided and driving circles. This axis is driven by a clockwork movement by means of a tangent screw. At the lower end of the polar axis a fork is fixed, to which are adjusted the pivots of the declination circle. The toothed declination wheel is set in motion at the foot of the instrument by a handle placed beside the one which produces movement in right ascension; both of these are near the two telescopes which serve for the reading of the two circles. The mirror with its cell has a total weight of 6,700 kilogrammes. This cell of cast steel is furnished with two pivots; to the back is fixed the directing rod. The interior of the cell is covered entirely with felt in such a way that the mirror has no point of contact with the metal. Being supported by as great a surface as possible, all deformations are avoided. The mirror and its cell are kept in equilibrium by a system of levers and counterpoises; the pivots rest on rollers adjusted at the top of the frame, which permits a circular movement by a vertical shaft and a system of independent rollers between two rails. The base of this frame floats in a cavity two meters in diameter on the south side of the pedestal, containing sufficient mercury to float nine-tenths of the total weight of the movable part, which weighs 15,000 kilogrammes. The clockwork movement is set in action by a weight of 100 kilogrammes. The total weight of the siderostat is 45,000 kilogrammes."

To produce the plane mirror for the siderostat a special furnace capable of holding twenty tons of glass had to be constructed at the Jeumont Works. The cooling of the glass in the annealing furnace after the mould had been filled took a whole month. The difficulty of the whole operation may be gathered from the fact that out of twelve discs only two were successful. The discs for the object glass were cast by M. Mantois and the figuring, polishing and mounting was the work of M. Gautier.

The telescopic tube is made of twenty-four pieces of sheet steel two millimeters thick. The tube has cast-iron supports which can move on rails fastened to stone pillars. Each lens of the object glass is set in a separate cell and they are so mounted on a carriage that moves on rails that they can readily be brought to the end of the

tube. The eyepiece end can carry a micrometer, photographic plate or a projecting lens.

The great power of the telescope is clear from the fact that the moon viewed through it will appear to the observer as if it was only 67 kilometers away. At such a distance calculation shows that an object one metre square on the moon should be visible.

THE ENTRANCE TO THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

The basin drained by the Mississippi river has an area of 1,244,000 square miles. The annual amount of sediment removed by erosion from this area, according to the experiments of Humphrey and Abbot, is 7,471,411,200 cubic feet. This mass of matter is sufficient to cover an area of one square mile 268 feet deep. If spread out over the whole area drained by the Mississippi it would cover it to the depth of 1-4640 of a foot or a depth of one foot is eroded from the surface of the basin every 4,640 years. These figures serve to give some idea of the amount of material carried yearly to the Gulf of Mexico by the Mississippi river.

As long as the velocity of the river is high the material is transported, but the moment this velocity is checked or reduced material is deposited. When the waters of the Mississippi mingle with the waters of the Gulf or meet the incoming tide they either loose their identity or have their velocity greatly reduced, and therefore deposit this material, forming bars across the entrance to the river.

From the time of the Louisiana purchase in 1803 many attempts were made to render the harbor navigable for large draught vessels, but it was not until May, 1875, that anything satisfactory was begun. At that time the Government awarded a contract to Captain James B. Eads for the deepening of what is known as the South Pass. In the face of many difficulties he secured a channel 26 feet deep and 700 feet wide which has been since maintained. This contract has now expired, and as the draught of vessels has increased new facilities are at present required.

Captain Eads secured the channel by means of jetties or parallel straight walls. The outflowing water confined in this narrow channel moved with greater velocity and hence had its power of carrying material so increased that the material was borne out beyond the channel. There it was deposited, and this necessitated the extension and maintenance of the jetties.

In January, 1899, a Board of Engineers reported that a channel of 35 feet depth could be secured by the plan of two parallel straight

jetties placed 2,400 feet apart. This channel would run through the Southwest Pass. These jetties would be seven miles long, making in all fourteen miles of construction, at an estimated cost of $13,000,000. The same amount would be necessary for extension and maintenance, or the latter item would cost the interest on that amount annually.

This report was referred by Congress to another board of four engineers, who reported a different plan. They suggested coffin-shaped jetties to run from the land through shallow water and at a considerable distance from the channel. On account of their great distance apart they would not be effective in making the channel, as in the case of the Eads jetties, but dredging would have to be resorted to for that purpose. The jetties would simply catch the silt and prevent its return after it was pumped out of the channel.

Nothing has been done in the matter yet, and the plan suggested in the *Scientific American Supplement* for August 8, 1900, by Professor Lewis M. Haupt, member of the Franklin Institute, deserves attention. The construction here suggested is called a reaction breakwater. The plan is based on observations made of the natural formation of bars and channels in the beds of rivers. Mr. Haupt points out that whenever a stream passes from a tangent to a curve there is at once a deepening of the channel along the concave side of the curve. The silt is thrown on the convex bank, which shallows gradually from the point of greatest depth. The plan he suggests is the reproduction of this natural action in the Southwest Pass. This he would do by building a single jetty with a curve of proper radius.

"A single, concave, curved jetty so placed as to encroach gradually upon the path of the stream produces a compression which causes deflection of the water and deep erosion of the sand, thereby creating a channel parallel to the axis of the jetty and also building a natural levee by the lateral transportation of displaced material."

It is estimated that a depth of 40 feet would be secured by such a reaction jetty. Such a plan is worthy of trial because it is cheaper than either of the other plans, and nothing stands in the way of its extension to the double jetty later should it prove inadequate.

SOLIDIFICATION OF HYDROGEN.

In 1898 Professor Dewar attempted the solidification of liquid hydrogen under reduced pressure. The liquid hydrogen was placed in a vacuum tube enclosed in a larger vessel of the same kind. The space between the two tubes was filled with hydrogen. The excess of evaporation was mainly from the hydrogen in this space. The

inside tube was maintained at the same temperature both inside and outside so as to prevent influx of heat. The hydrogen was evaporated under 10 min. pressure, but the experiment failed.

During the past year Professor Dewar while investigating the reduction of temperature brought about by exhaustion noticed that there was a leakage of air which became apparent by being frozen in an "air-snow" inside the vessel when it met the cold vapor of hydrogen coming off. He first thought that this body was a sponge of solid air containing the hydrogen. But the fact that this solid evaporated at the low pressure without having any solid air led him to conclude that the body must be solid hydrogen. This was confirmed by the fact that if the pressure and temperature of the hydrogen were raised the solid melted when the pressure reached 58 min.

The failure of the first experiments was due to the supercooling of the liquid. The solidification of hydrogen is interesting, inasmuch as it seems to many to settle the question which has long been a matter of doubt, viz., whether hydrogen should be classed as a metallic or a non-metallic element. Up to the present it was most frequently classed among the former; now, however, it must be placed among the latter.

FROST FIGHTING.

Under the above title the United States Weather Bureau has published Bulletin No. 29, prepared by A. G. McAdie, local forecast official at San Francisco. The citrus fruit crop of California, especially of the section south of the Tehachapi, has frequently suffered considerably from frost, and the loss has been considered unavoidable. For the past four years the Weather Bureau office at San Francisco has given much attention to this matter, and the experience gathered, according to Mr. McAdie, warrants the statement that unless extreme conditions—that is, unless lower temperatures by 5 degrees than have ever yet been experienced—occur, the loss can be prevented. Every effort has been made, and successfully, to forecast coming frosts and also to investigate the best methods of protection.

It has been found that the formation of frost is largely a matter of air drainage. When a wave of falling pressure passes southwestward into the citrus belt and is followed by a rise in pressure, it is the forerunner of much colder weather. The warm lower air strata are vigorously displaced by cold dry air, and the cold air settling in a period of quiet, after the drainage has ceased, forms frost. What is true on a large scale for frost belts is also true on a small scale for areas of stagnant cold air. On almost every ranch there are certain

cold spots which almost invariably correspond with depressions in the ground. Three conclusions are well established from the study that has been made: First, when the air is in brisk motion the damage from frost is generally light; secondly, stagnant air in depressions favors frost; thirdly, since the coldest air is generally near the ground it is sometimes advisable to drain downwards warm air from above. The ranch owners are advised not only to keep in communication with the nearest weather bureau, but to make a careful study of their own ranches. Whenever frost warnings are sent out they should carefully determine the temperature and dew-point during the late afternoon and night according to the instructions issued to them. Thus will they be prepared to take precautionary measures.

Various methods of protection have been employed, some with considerable success. These methods include those based on mixing the air, warming the air, cloud or fog formation, irrigation, spraying and screening.

The method of mixing the air consists in keeping up a circulation of the air. In this method wind-breaks are often employed. If not so constructed as to prevent a natural circulation or to facilitate behind them areas of stagnant air, they are of benefit.

The method of warming the air usually adopted and considered effective is either to scatter over the ground or suspend a few feet above the ground about forty wire baskets to the acre and to start charcoal fires in them when the conditions indicate frost. By this method the temperature can be certainly raised 3 or 4 degrees. Oil pots have been used for the same purpose, but the deposit of lampblack upon the fruit is objectionable.

The cloud or fog formation is secured by burning damp straw, old wood, manure, etc. When burning briskly it makes a good smoke, and if doused with water, a steamy smoke is formed which serves as a screen to prevent the radiation of heat from the land. It also prevents the too rapid heating of the chilled fruit at sunrise.

Water on account of its high specific heat is an excellent agency for the storage of heat. Hot water pumped into flumes and runs through furrows made in different directions through the ranch. This method and the basket method have given the best results so far obtained in the way of raising the temperature and are in most favor.

The method of spraying is employed chiefly after a frost or just before the frost has ended. Its efficiency consists in preventing a too rapid heating of the chilled fruit.

Canvas, muslin or light wood work have been used as screens to protect the fruit. These screens are, of course, only modified hot-

houses, and are undoubtedly effective. Their cost, however, is so great as to prohibit their extensive use.

When we recall that the value of the citrus fruits of the district in question amounted in 1899 to $7,000,000, we can realize the importance of the work undertaken by the United States Weather Bureau.

THE REBUILDING OF GALVESTON.

Were geology consulted it would be adverse to the rebuilding of the ruined city of Galveston on the old site. In common with the whole Atlantic seaboard, the location is continually subsiding.

The evidence of subsidence all along the Atlantic coast is to be found in the advance of the sea even in historic times. Submerged forests and meadows, drowned rivers, half-flooded islands and outlying keys point to recent submergence or a present gradual sinking.

The sinking of the shore on which Galveston stands is a serious matter. The city was built on a sand bank, the highest point of which was only twelve feet above low tide. A subsidence of from one to two feet in a century is fatal to a city so situated. Each succeeding heavy wind and wave storm is bound to work more and more havoc.

The nature of the formation on which the city rose shows how poor the site is for anything like firm and permanent building. The formation underlying Galveston is simply a pile of loose sand, with that compactness only which comes from the occasional beating of a high sea and that which results from the compression due to its own weight. There were no coral formations to hold the mass of loose sand together, as the roots of trees bind and hold the loose surface soil. There was no calcareous or silicious matter to cement the loose granules into a compact stone. To the depth of half a mile there is no such thing as solid rock, nothing but loose mechanical deposit. Therefore it was impossible to secure firm foundations, except at enormous expense, to withstand severe storms. To rebuild on the same site is to expose the new city to another calamity.

It has been suggested to use the old site for a port and connect it by means of a canal about ten miles long with a new city built at the head of Galveston Bay. The number required at the docks and storehouses of the port would be comparatively few, and should such a storm ever again visit Galveston, the loss of human life would be reduced to a minimum.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION: Studies in the Religious Life and Thought of the English People in the period preceding the rejection of the Roman Jurisdiction by Henry VIII." By Francis Aidan Gasquet, O. S. B., D. D. [London: J. C. Nimmo, 1900.]

In the second of the "Lectures on the Present State of Catholics in England," Newman treats of the Protestant Tradition which has Fable for its basis. Writing in 1851 he says: "Trace up, then, the Tradition to its very first startings, its roots and its sources if you are to form a judgment whether it is more than a Tradition. It may be a good Tradition and yet after all good for nothing. What profit though ninety-nine links of a chain be sound if the topmost is broken? Now, I do not hesitate to say that this Protestant Tradition on which English faith hangs is wanting in the first link."[1]

Few statements have been so confidently made or so thoroughly believed as that the cause of the Reformation in England was the low state of religion resulting from an ignorant clergy and a superstitious laity. According to the prevailing Tradition, the light of the Gospel was practically unknown: the whole country was immersed in a gross darkness. So surely was this state of affairs impressed on Englishmen that even Catholics accepted the story, with a sigh, indeed, and regrets that the salt had lost its savor. But when the new historical spirit arose and writers were no longer content to copy one another, but saw the necessity of testing every statement and of hunting down assertions to their sources, enough was speedily found to give them pause and excite their wonder that facts could have been so neglected for fancies. The State papers were opened to the public; and students who spend their days handling old parchments and deciphering, sometimes with the aid of a magnifying glass, faded manuscripts, begin to see that quite another story was told by the Actors who had taken part in the Drama of the Past. Among those compelled, by exact knowledge, to form an opinion is the late Mr. Brewer, who calendared the State papers of the early years of Henry VIII. He warns the student that he will miss the meaning of many things if he starts his inquiry by regarding the Reformation as the creation of Light to illuminate a previous period of darkness, or the evolution of practical morality out of a state of antecedent chaotic corruption. "In fact," says he, "the sixteenth century was not a mass of moral corruption out of which life emerged by some process unknown to art or nature; it was not an addled egg cradling a living bird; quite the re-

[1] Ed. 1851, p. 84.

verse." And in another passage he says: "There is no reason to suppose that the nation as a body was discontented with the old religion. Facts point to the opposite conclusion. . . . Nor, considering the temper of the English people, is it possible that immorality could have existed among the ancient clergy to the degree which poets, preachers and satirists might lead us to suppose. The existence of such corruptions is not justified by authentic documents or by an impartial and broad estimate of the character and conduct of the nation before the Reformation."[2]

The inquiry has been now carried a step farther. Dom Gasquet, the English Benedictine, whose work is a credit to his order, his country and to the Church at large, recently published a profound study on "The Eve of the Reformation." His purpose is a simple one. He does not in any way pretend to write a history of the Reformation or to furnish "an adequate account of the causes which led up to it;" for, at the present moment, the work of the historian is that of analysis, of clearing the ground, of making the crooked straight and the rough places plain. To this solid and most essential work Dom Gasquet, with the true Benedictine instinct of thoroughness, is devoting himself. He has realized that before any one can undertake to discourse to any real purpose upon the history of this period, it is necessary "to ascertain, if possible, what really was the position of the Church in the eyes of the nation at large on the eve of the Reformation, to understand the attitude of men's minds to the system as they knew it, and to discover, as far as may be, what in regard to religion they were doing and saying and thinking about when the change came upon them" (p. 3). We do not hesitate to say that Dom Gasquet, in this new book, has given us a more vitally important work than in any of his previous volumes. If in his "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries" he freed the monks of England from the Protestant Tradition, in "The Eve of the Reformation" he restores the character not only of the Church in England, but of the nation at large.

We do not propose to give a detailed review of this noteworthy book; we will content ourselves with setting before our readers certain conclusions we have arrived at after a due weighing of the evidence Dom Gasquet sets before us. We are the more ready to pursue this course as, among all the notices and reviews, most of them written by prominent men and specialists and all bearing witness to the great value of Dom Gasquet's work, no one, as far as we know, has grasped what we think is the real and useful lesson the book contains. The author, it is true, does not draw any con-

[2] "The Reign of Henry VIII.," II., 459-70.

clusion from the facts he so skilfully sets before his reader. This would have been beyond the scope of his work, and he is too experienced an artist to overcrowd his canvas. But facts speak for themselves; and he who runs through these pages may listen to them if he have wit enough. We have therefore selected two of the main features of the period and shall confine our remarks to these, passing by much else that is of interest in the volume before us. It will be noted that the points we have selected have a bearing on questions of present-day interest.

A common Protestant Tradition is that one of the causes of the Reformation in England was the Revival of Letters or, as writers are pleased to call it, "The New Learning." This phrase, "The New Learning," is very dear to them; it is such a convenient weapon of offense: and moreover the very phrase is sixteenth century and can be found in the writings of the most zealous opponents of the Reformation. There can be no doubt that the orthodox champions were opponents of the New Learning. What further proof do we need, cry the Protestant writers, to show that the Catholic Church is an enemy to learning and battens on Ignorance? But softly! Facts knock the bottom out of the Protestant Tradition. In the sixteenth century the phrase "The New Learning" had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the Revival of Letters. It was simply and solely in the Reformation days "a well recognized expression used to denote the novel religious teaching of Luther and his followers. Uncompromising hostility to such novelties, no doubt, marked the religious attitude of many who were at the same time the most strenuous advocates of the renaissance of letters. This is so obvious in the works of the period that were it not for the common misuse of the expression at the present day, and for the fact that opposition to the 'New Learning' is assumed on all hands to represent hostility to letters rather than to novel teachings in religious matters, there would be no need to furnish examples of its real use in the period in question" (p. 16). Dom Gasquet proceeds to give from the abundant literature of the day examples of the only sense in which the phrase was used.[3] We will take only one of his witnesses. The preacher Robert Edgeworth praises the simple-hearted faith that was accepted by all "before this wicked 'New Learning' arose in Saxony and came over into England amongst us." If we regard the mere facts of the case, we shall have to agree with our author that: "It would seem, moreover, that the

[3] A moment's thought will show that *New Learning* applied to a revival of the *Old Learning* would be altogether a misnomer; whereas, applied to new doctrines, it is a very fit and proper term. Controversialists, sometimes in their hurry, *in excessu suo*, as the Psalmist would say, forget the obvious.

religious position of many ecclesiastics and laymen has been completely misunderstood by the meaning now so commonly assigned to the expression. Men like Erasmus, Colet and, to a recent extent, More himself, have been regarded, to say the least, as, at heart, very lukewarm adherents of the Church, precisely because of their strong advocacy of the movement known to us as the Literary Revival, which, identified by modern writers with the 'New Learning,' was, it is wrongfully assumed, condemned by orthodox churchmen. The Reformers are thus made the champions of learning; Catholics, the upholders of ignorance and the hereditary and bitter foes of all intellectual improvements" (p. 20). There is no difficulty in showing that it was precisely such enlightened churchmen, orthodox and zealous, as Colet, Fisher, Wareham, Wolsey, Erasmus and, above all, the Benedictine monks of the primatial Church of Canterbury that were the foremost and most enthusiastic upholders of the Revival of Letters. The very introduction of Greek is due to Benedictines. Two Canterbury monks, Selling and Hadley, in 1464, with the leave of prior Thomas Goldstone of Christ Church, went to study in Italy at Padua, Bologna and Rome. Selling, who in 1472 became Prior of Canterbury, made his claustral school a centre for the study of Greek. The famous Linacre was one of his pupils; and in 1486 Prior Selling took him "to Italy in order to profit by the teaching of the great humanist masters at the universities there" (p. 28). Grocyn, who taught both More and Erasmus Greek, was a sharer with Linacre in "the benefits of the training in literature then to be obtained only in Italy." A Venetian traveler, who visited England in 1500, puts on record what he had noticed as regards the attitude of the clergy as a body towards learning. He says: "Few, excepting the clergy, are addicted to the study of letters, and this is the reason why any one who has any learning, though he be a layman, is called a *clerk*."[4] As a matter of fact Churchmen had everything to hope from the Revival of Letters. The greatest enemy superstition can have is Learning; and no greater foe is there to true Religion than Superstition.[5] Far from the Reformation being a friend to Learning, the immediate effect in England was its practical extinction. The official Registers of

[4] In English law members of the three learned professions, the Church, the Law and Medicine, are to-day technically *clerks*. [5] That there were cases of superstition in England More witnesses. There are such cases now here and everywhere else. Newman pertinently remarks: "The religion of the multitude is ever vulgar and abnormal; it ever will be tinctured with fanaticism and superstition while men are what they are. A people's religion is ever a corrupt religion, in spite of the provisions of Holy Church." ("Difficulties of Anglicans," II., p. 81.) It would, of course, be illogical to accuse the Church because men abuse that which is good. Her battle has ever been two-fold, against unbelief from without and against superstition from within.

the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge bring their silent testimony to this fact. At Oxford, from 1449 to 1459, the average number of degrees taken by all students was 91.5. From 1506 to 1535 the average was 127. In the year 1506 it had risen to 216. When the attack on the monasteries had begun by Henry VIII., the degrees, which in 1535 were 108, fell in the next year to 44, and for the rest of the reign the average was less than 57. From 1548 to 1553, during which period [Edward VI.] the Reformers had a free hand, the average of graduates was barely 33; but as soon as Mary was on the throne it rose to 70. Cambridge tells the same story. In 1545 the university had fallen to such a depth that the scholars petitioned the King "for an extension of privileges, as they feared the total destruction of Learning." In the year 1550 there was apparently no degree of any kind taken at the university.

So once more the veil is torn away that for three hundred years has hidden the features of Truth. But it will take a long time for the light to permeate the prejudices which the Protestant Tradition has brought on men's minds. For instance, in the Church of England newspaper, *The Guardian*, a journal of high literary repute, a recent critic still clings to his use of the term "New Learning" as meaning the Revival of Letters; and in spite of the absolute evidence to the contrary refuses to change his *mumpsimus* for our *sumpsimus*.

In three important chapters Dom Gasquet studies the relation of the Church to the State: and the first of these chapters goes to the whole root of the matter. Indeed, we consider it the most important part of this most important book. Our author *more suo* is simply investigating facts. While showing that England was most thoroughly united to the Pope in all his spiritual attributes and fully and amply acknowledged his primacy, there were "a number of questions mainly in the broad borderland of debatable ground between the two *(jurisdictions, the spiritual and the temporal)* . . . constantly being discussed and not infrequently *(giving)* cause for disagreements and misunderstanding. As in the history of earlier times, so in the sixteenth century, ecclesiastics clung, perhaps not unnaturally, to what they regarded as their sacred rights and looked on resistance to encroachments as a sacred duty. Laymen, on the other part, even when their absolute loyalty to the Church was undoubted, were found in the ranks of those who claimed for the State power to decide in matters not strictly pertaining to the spiritual prerogatives, but which chiefly by custom had come to be regarded as belonging to ecclesiastical domain. It is the more important that attention should be directed in a special manner to these questions, inasmuch as it will be found, speaking broadly, that

the ultimate success or ill success of the strictly doctrinal changes raised in the sixteenth century was determined by the issue of the discussions raised on the question of mixed jurisdiction. This may not seem very philosophical, but in the event it proved to be roughly correct. The reason is not far to seek. In great measure at least questions of money and property, even of national interest and prosperity, were intimately concerned in the matters in dispute. They touched the people's pocket; and whether rightly or wrongly, those who found the money wished to have a say in its disposal. One thing cannot fail to strike an inquirer into the literature of this period—the very small number of people who were enthusiasts in the doctrinal matters with which the more ardent reformers occupied themselves" (pp. 51, 52).

As Dom Gasquet in examining the question at issue between the two jurisdictions says his purpose is "to record rather than to criticize," our readers will allow us to take up the threads of the discourse and weave them into a plain and straightforward account of what, as a matter of fact, did cause the Reformation. At least we shall set down the conclusions at which we have arrived after a study of the general state of Europe at that period.

Good and zealous Catholics can make a sharp and clear distinction between the spiritual powers of the Pope and his temporal claims. Taking a broad view of history we find England always acted most generously with him in the matter of these temporal claims. The question of justice was not closely looked into by either side. The Pope had in England a freer hand than anywhere else. Other Catholic nations meanwhile had settled their own difficulties with the Temporal claims of Rome, each in its own way; and each one, be it noted, to its own advantage. England alone never exploited the Papacy in its own interests. "History has shown," says Dom Gasquet, "that most of these claims have in practice been disallowed, not only without detriment to the spiritual work of the Church, but in some instances, at least, it was the frank recognition of the State rights, which, under Providence, saved nations from the general defection which seemed to threaten the old Ecclesiastical system. Most of the difficulties which were, as we have seen, experienced and debated in England were unfelt in Spain, where the Sovereign from the first made his position as to the temporalities of the Church clearly understood by all. In Naples in like manner the right of State Patronage, however objectionable to the ecclesiastical legists, was strictly maintained. In France the danger which at one time threatened an overthrow of religion similar to that which had fallen on Germany and which, at

the time, was looming dark over England, was averted by the celebrated Concordat between Leo X. and Francis I. . . . It is to this settlement of outstanding difficulties, the constant causes of friction—a settlement of difficulties which must be regarded as economic and administrative rather than religious—that so good a judge as M. Hanotaux, the statesman and historian, attributes nothing less than the maintenance of the old religion in France" (pp. 76-7).

But in England we are brought face to face with another state of affairs. As we have said, the nation dealt generously with Rome in the matter of these disputable claims. There was in England a special filial love which on the whole refused to scrutinize too closely the actions of the parent. If some doings of the *Curia* caused laws of Præmuniri to be passed in self-defense, yet in practice these regulations were not enforced. In spite of the letter of the Civil Law the Pope was allowed to have his own way, though this was often to the spiritual as well as the temporal detriment of the country. The saying of Innocent IV., which Matthew Paris chronicles, shows the view in which the country was regarded at Rome: "Truly England is our storehouse of delights, a very inexhaustible well: and where much abounds much more can be extorted from many." It was the old story of the Goose that laid the golden eggs. Rome acted towards England in a way unknown elsewhere. The cession John Lackland had made of his crown was treated as a very serious reality by Roman Legists, who, despite the constant refusal of the English people to sanction it, looked upon the country as a mere temporal appendage or vassal of the Holy See. This will account in measure for the attitude adopted by the *Curia* towards England and the manifest disinclination to treat her in the same way as other nations. The *Curia* in one way or another clung to these temporal claims long after the Reformation. The upsetting of Pole's work of conciliation, the refusal to acknowledge Elizabeth, the bull of Pius V., the Armada, the sad and bloody history of the Deposing Power, are all links in the same chain. What was tolerated, say in France, was not allowed in England despite the cruel persecutions such denials implied. So marked had this difference been that when Conn asked Cardinal Barberini why what was lawful in France could not be tolerated in England, the only reply was: "The French do not trouble themselves to consult Rome about such questions; but the English and the Irish do; and Rome, if asked, can only answer according to what fits in with her laws." It seems to us a conclusion based on facts that had England been treated as other countries, and had claims which do not touch vitally the spir-

itual prerogatives of the Primacy given way to the higher good, there was no reason in the course of things why England, putting aside the question of the Divorce, should not have retained the faith as France and Spain did.

And this conclusion is strengthened by a further consideration. Dom Gasquet shows that the spiritual state of England was good. The Pope's real authority was cordially acknowledged; the clergy, as a body, were neither ignorant nor immoral; the mutual relations of priests and people were normal; the Church was bound up with the national life in a way we can in these days but little realize; the laity had an interest and a right in their parish church which in temporal matters they, along with the clergy, managed and provided for, and with which were connected their guilds and other social undertakings; they were well instructed in the simple and necessary truths of a religion they loved and practised; there was no dogmatic quarrel except under the stress of the Lutheran invasion; there was not even any difficulty [oh, poor Protestant Tradition!] about having the Bible in English provided that it was the Word of God and not that of Wyckliffe or Tyndale. In other words, there was nothing from the spiritual standpoint which needed reformation in the sense which Protestants have attached to that term. And yet England was allowed to drift away. We have noticed the cases of France and Spain; and as to Germany, Jansen, in his "History of the German People," tells us that the religious state of that country was by no means bad.

But if we look to Italy we find a state of spiritual debasement which was the shame of Europe. It was avowed. Paul III. in 1538 appointed a commission of four Cardinals, Contarini, Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV.), Sadoletus and the Englishman Pole, with five others to report upon the state of the Church, that is to say, of the Church in Italy. Their report, known as the *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, is a very frank but painful document. After thanking God, who had inspired the Pope "to put forward his hands to support the ruins of the tottering and almost fallen Church of Christ and to raise it again to its pristine height," the Commission refer to the Pope's orders that they should lay bare to him "those most grave abuses, that is diseases, by which the Church of God and this Roman *Curia* especially is afflicted and which has brought about the state of ruin now so evident." They say boldly that the primary cause has been that the Popes have surrounded themselves with those only who spoke what they thought would be pleasing and who had neither the honesty nor the loyalty to speak the truth. This flattery had deceived the Pope about many things. "To get

the truth to their ears was always most difficult. Teachers sprung up who were ready to declare that the Pope was master of all benefices, and as master might by right sell them as his own." Consequently he could not be guilty of sinning. The Pope's will was the highest law and could override all law. "Hence, Holy Father, as from the horse of Troy have so many abuses and most grievous dangers grown up in God's Church," so that it has become a bye-word of reproach even to pagans. The commissioners call upon the Pope to begin the cure whence sprung the disease. "Follow the teaching of the holy Apostle Paul: *Be a dispenser and not a lord.*" They then sum up under twenty-two heads the abuses which were disgracing the Church in Italy.[6] One thing is now clear. We are brought face to face with the fact that the temporal claims advanced by the flatterers in the *Curia* and the lust of domination had resulted in the spiritual misery of Italy. Four centuries before had St. Bernard warned Eugenius against the lust of domination, *libidinem dominandi*, as being what he feared the most for him.[7] Alas that the warnings had not been heeded!

To turn back to the history of England, do we not see the same result from the same cause, *i. e.*, Religion allowed to suffer as long as Canonists could sustain the doctrine that the Pope's will was the highest law? We may fairly ask the question: Why was it that the Reformation did not succeed where Religion was at its lowest and did succeed where it was in a good state? Are we to say that in Italy, while the Temporal claims were actively in force, the spiritual state of the people was left to shift for itself, but in England this was sacrificed in a vain attempt to enforce the other? This may not be, as Dom Gasquet would have said, "very philosophical." We may even be accused of putting the question with somewhat of brutal plainness. But is it true?

The Benedictine has some pregnant words at the end of his volume; and they are to our purpose. "It is already evident that the corruptions or the virtues prevailing in one quarter must not straightway be credited to the account of another; that the reason why one country has become Protestant or another remained Catholic has to be sought for in each case, and that it may be safely asserted that the maintenance of Catholicity or the adoption of Protestantism in different regions had comparatively little to do with prevalence or absence of abuses or as little depended on the question whether these were more or less grievous" (pp. 446-7).

[6] The whole document can be seen in Le Plat's "Monumenta Concilii Tridentini," Vol. II., pp. 596-605. It is said that the document was drawn up by Caraffa. [7] Migne P. L., Vol. 182, p. 759.

We on our own part have deliberately gone beyond the limits of his book; for we believe the time has come when we should inquire closely what it was that lost England and Germany to the Church and what it was that saved France and Spain. We are concerned more with causes than with results; for we hold there is a present-day significance in the Past and there are lessons, important and vital, to be learnt on both sides.

We must not let this occasion pass without offering our congratulations to Dom Gasquet for this contribution to English history. It is a work of essential importance, which will have to be studied by all who wish to know the Reformation Period. While the impartial student will welcome gladly these results of the Benedictine method of historical research, there are we think two classes of readers who may not like it, as they will feel its power, viz.: Those who, stopping their ears, call out "Great is Diana of the Ephesians;" and those who only care for history as a controversial weapon. And methinks these two classes are wondrously akin.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

FATHER ANTHONY: A Romance of To-Day. By *Robert Buchanan*. 12mo, pp. 261. New York: G. W. Dillingham Company.

The scene is laid in Ireland at the present day. Father Anthony is a young Catholic priest who was in love with the heroine until he learned that his younger and only brother Michael loved her, when he gave her up and studied for the priesthood. He told his parish priest of this love shortly before his ordination, and he was advised not to go on, but he did not follow the advice. He was ordained, and he loved the girl to the end, which, fortunately for him, came soon.

In the meantime his brother was accused of murdering the girl's father, and the real murderer confessed to Father Anthony. The story is taken up principally with clearing the innocent and bringing the guilt home to the proper person. An English doctor, who is visiting the town, undertakes to play the detective, and he does it so clumsily that he is not worthy of a place even in fiction. The only other priest that appears is Father John, the pastor of the village, who is a disgrace to the cloth. He is seen oftenest in taverns, shebeens or in the house of some bibulous friend. On all these occasions he is drinking freely with laymen and in the presence of drunken members of his own parish. On more than one occasion the author plainly hints that he was drunk, and yet he expresses admiration for him.

The writer's ignorance of Catholic terms and practice ought to debar him from this field of literature. We imagine that the Catholic priests of Ireland, and especially those of the district where the scene of the story is laid, will not thank the author for these two pictures of brother priests. They are types that will hardly increase the respect of the public, either Catholic or Protestant, for the Roman Catholic clergy.

THE HISTORY OF THE DEVIL AND THE IDEA OF EVIL FROM THE EARLIEST TIME TO THE PRESENT DAY. By *Dr. Paul Carus*. Large 8vo., pp. 496. Profusely illustrated. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

We have the introduction to this strange book, and it contains some remarkable statements. For instance: . . . "The idea of a personal God is a mere simile. . . . When we speak of God as a person we ought to be conscious of the fact that we use an allegory which, if it were taken literally, can only belittle Him. The God of the future will not be personal, but superpersonal. But how shall we reach this knowledge of the superpersonal God? Our answer is, with the help of science. Let us pursue in religion the same path that science travels, and the narrowness of sectarianism will develop into a broad cosmical religion which shall be as wide and truly Catholic as is science itself." Again he tells us that God is not an individual being, but that He is the prototype of personality. In this spirit he approaches the study of the devil, and speaks of him as the counterpart of the idea of God. He thinks that the devil has been much neglected by philosophers and progressive theologians, and therefore he devotes his attention to him.

It is a curious book, very nicely made. We do not believe that it possesses any real value, because we do not believe that Dr. Carus is fitted to handle such a subject. We do not see what good can come from it except to amuse the curious. The doctor has a peculiar way of quoting text after text and disposing of them in a line, although some of them have puzzled Biblical scholars of deep learning. It is very easy to dispose of difficulties in this superficial manner, and to build up conclusions on such hastily constructed premises, but they are houses erected on sand. We cannot advise our readers to buy this book. It is very expensive and of no practical use.

ST. PETER IN ROME, and His Tomb on the Vatican Hill. By *Rev. Arthur Stapylton Barnes, M. A.*, Priest of the Diocese of Westminster. With thirty full-page illustrations and several text illustrations. Large 8vo, pp. 395. London: Swan Sonnenscheim & Co.

A very important contribution to a long controverted question. But the reverend author does not admit that it is any longer an open

question. He claims that it has long ago been removed from the region of doubt, and in that frame of mind he treats it. He confines himself principally to the line of evidence which is drawn from archæology. He does not ignore the evidence of the Sacred Scriptures and of ancient writers, but he passes over them briefly, because they have been treated at length by other writers on more than one occasion, and dwells on the archæological evidence which has been almost entirely neglected hitherto by English writers.

In this field Professor Lanciani, who is by common consent the leading living authority on Roman antiquities, furnishes the safest guide. Our author follows him. The work is very interesting and very valuable. It is really a history of the tomb of St. Peter from the moment of his burial down to the rebuilding of Rome's greatest temple. In the development of this history the archæological proofs of St. Peter's presence and death in Rome are clearly set forth. Without St. Peter in Rome the great church that bears his name loses its significance.

The book furnishes one more link in the chain of evidence which was always complete in itself, but not always known to the general reader. It will be welcomed by all thoughtful persons who are interested in so important an historical truth.

THE LIFE OF ST. MARY MAGDALEN DE PAZZI. Compiled by Rev. Placido Fabrini. Translated and published by Rev. Antonio Isoleri, Miss. Ap. Rector of the Italian Church of St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi, Philadelphia. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 470. Philadelphia: 710 Montrose street.

The reverend translator of this best life of the Seraphic Saint was moved to undertake the work because no adequate life in English was to be found, and because of the great value of such a work. She was indeed a wonderful saint, whose life seems almost incredible. The wonderful ecstasies and the private revelations that were vouchsafed to her, in addition to her extradinary virtues, stamp her as preëminent even in so distinguished a school. The preservation of her body throughout the centuries is another feature of her case that appeals to all devout souls and draws them towards her. There, indeed, is much to edify, much to instruct the respectful reader of any faith. The book is divided into two parts: the first contains the life of the saint, and the second contains her letters and other works. Father Isoleri merits the respect and gratitude of all by this excellent work.

GESCHICHTE DER WELTLITERATUR. Von *Alexander Baumgartner, S. J.* Vol. III. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder, 1900.

In the third volume of his "History of the Literature of the World" Father Baumgartner deals with the interesting subject of

the literature of ancient Greece and Rome. He divides his treatise into three books, in the first of which, occupying three hundred and thirty-three pages, or considerably more than one-half the whole volume, he treats of the classical literature of the Greeks. In the second book he gives a survey of classical Roman literature. The third book deals succinctly with Grecian literature in the period of the Roman Empire. We do not hesitate to pronounce this work the most perfect handbook of classical literature which has appeared in any tongue. It is a mine of information on all subjects connected with the literature of Greece and Rome, and will be an invaluable aid to all engaged in the teaching of the classical writers.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

SERMONS ON THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. From the German of Rev. J. B. Scheurer, D. D. Edited by Rev. F. X. Lasance. 8vo, pp. 351. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A MONTH'S MEDITATIONS. By *Cardinal Wiseman*. 12mo, pp. 222. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LECTURES FOR BOYS. By the *Very Rev. Francis Cuthbert Doyle, O. S. B.* 8vo, Vols. 2 and 3, pp. 414 and 509. London: Washburne & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE PERFECT RELIGIOUS. For the Use of Confessors in Convents, the Inmates of Convents and those who aspire to the Religious Life. Instructions of Monseigneur d'Orleans de la Motte, Bishop of Amiens. 16mo, pp. 242. Price $1.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE FOUR LAST THINGS: DEATH, JUDGMENT, HELL, HEAVEN. By *Father Martin von Cochem, O. S. F. C.* 16mo, pp. 223. Price 75 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

OXFORD CONFERENCES, Summer Term, 1899. On Grace. By *Rev. Raphael M. Moss, O. P.* 12mo, pp. 109. Price 60 cents in paper. Received from Benziger Brothers.

A DAUGHTER OF FRANCE, 1464-1505. Being Records of Blessed Jane, Foundress of the Order of the Annunciation. 12mo, pp. 145. Price 60 cents. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LES ENFANTS DE NAZARETH. Par *l'Abbe E. Le Camus*. Paris: 60 rue Madame.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EARLY CHURCH. By *Rev. J. J. Burke*. 12mo, pp. 148. Baltimore: John Murphy.

THE TRUE STORY OF MASTER GERALD. By *Anna T. Sadlier*. 12mo, pp. 321. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LOT LESLIE'S FOLKS. By *Eleanor C. Donnelly*.

'TWAS TO BE. By *Henri Ardel*. Translated from the French by Francis T. Furey.

LITTLE ARLETTE. By *Henri Ardel*. Translated from the French by Francis T. Fure y Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co.

A SERIES OF TEN SERMONS FOR A JUBILEE RETREAT. By *Rev. Francis X. McGowan, O. S. A.* 12mo, paper, pp. 155. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

The Church, the Jesuit Order and English Catholic literature have sustained a grievous loss in the demise of the Rev. Richard F. Clarke, of Clarke's Hall, Oxford. One of the brightest, boldest and most erudite of the famous Oxford school, Father Clarke, ever since his reception into the true fold, had done marvels as a champion of the advanced Catholic school. *The Month*, which he edited with rare ability for several years, will particularly miss his trenchant and masterful hand, and our heartfelt condolences are therefore extended to our esteemed contemporary.

70757

PERIODICAL

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE